arXiv:1111.7057v1 [math.RT] 30 Nov 2011

DEFINABILITY RESULTS FOR INVARIANT DISTRIBUTIONS ON A REDUCTIVE UNRAMIFIED p-ADIC GROUP

RAF CLUCKERS, JULIA GORDON AND IMMANUEL HALUPCZOK

Abstract. Let $\mathbf{G}$ be a connected reductive algebraic group over a non-Archimedean local field $\mathbb{K}$, and let $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. By a theorem of Harish-Chandra, if $\mathbb{K}$ has characteristic zero, the Fourier transforms of nilpotent orbital integrals are represented on the set of regular elements in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ by locally constant functions, which, extended by zero to all of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, are locally integrable. In this paper, we prove that if the group $\mathbf{G}$ is unramified, these functions are in fact specializations of constructible motivic exponential functions. Combining this with the Transfer Principle for integrability of [15], we obtain that Harish-Chandra's theorem holds also when $\mathbb{K}$ is a non-Archimedean local field of sufficiently large positive characteristic. Under some mild hypotheses, this also implies local integrability in a neighbourhood of the identity element of Harish-Chandra characters of admissible representations of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, with $\mathbf{G}$ an unramified connected reductive algebraic group, and $\mathbb{K}$ an equicharacteristic field of sufficiently large (depending on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$) characteristic.

1. Introduction

In this paper we carry out another step in the program outlined by T.C. Hales in [24] of making harmonic analysis on reductive groups over non-Archimedean local fields "field-independent" via the use of motivic integration. As an application, using the Transfer Principle [15], we obtain an extension of Harish-Chandra's theorems about local integrability of the functions representing various distributions arising in harmonic analysis on p-adic groups to the positive characteristic case, when the residue characteristic is large. As the title suggests, this paper relies heavily on the results of S. DeBacker, [16].

We start by reviewing some of the classical results. For the time being, let $\mathbb{K}$ be a non-Archimedean local field (with no assumption on its characteristic), and let $\mathbf{G}$ be a reductive algebraic group over $\mathbb{K}$, and $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra. Let (π, V) be an irreducible admissible representation of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$. Then the *distribution character* of π is the distribution on the space $C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}))$ of locally constant, compactly supported functions on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ defined by

$$\Theta_\pi(f) = \mathrm{Tr} \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})} f(g)\pi(g)\, dg$$

(since π is admissible, the linear operator on the right-hand side is of finite rank, and hence its trace is well defined). Let $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$; we denote by $\mathcal{O}_X$ its adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_X = \{\mathrm{Ad}(g)X \mid g \in \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_X$ (with the p-adic topology) is homeomorphic to $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/C_G(X)$ (where $C_G(X)$ is the stabilizer of X); the space $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/C_G(X)$ carries a G-invariant quotient measure. For the fields $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic zero, it was proved by Deligne and Ranga Rao [36] that when transported to the orbit of X, this measure is a Radon measure on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, i.e., it is finite on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ (strictly speaking, it is the group version of this statement that is proved in [36], but in characteristic zero this is equivalent to the Lie algebra version). We denote this quotient measure on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/C_G(X)$ by d^*g; then the *orbital integral* at X is the distribution Φ_X on $C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$ defined by

$$\Phi_X(f) = \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/C_G(X)} f(\mathrm{Ad}(g)X) d^*g.$$

It is known that for the fields of positive characteristic, the proofs in [36] work when the characteristic is sufficiently large, and thus the orbital integral is a well defined distribution. We discuss this in more detail in §5.3.

When the field $\mathbb{K}$ has *characteristic zero*, and $\mathbf{G}$ is connected, the following facts are due to Howe [28] and Harish-Chandra [26], [27]:

(1) There exists a locally constant function θ_π defined on the set of regular elements $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ that represents the distribution character:

$$\Theta_\pi(f) = \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})} \theta_\pi(g) f(g)\, dg,$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}})$. The function θ_π is called the Harish-Chandra character.

(2) Extended by zero from $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ to all of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, the function θ_π is locally integrable, and therefore (1) holds for all $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}))$, without any restriction on the support of f. Moreover,

(3) For $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, let $D_G(X)$ be the coefficient at t^l in the characteristic polynomial of $\mathrm{ad}(X)$, where l is the rank of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the function $X \mapsto |D_G(X)|^{1/2}\theta_\pi(\exp(X))$ is locally bounded in a neighbourhood of 0 in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. Here exp is the exponential map, mapping a neighbourhood of zero in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ to a neighbourhood of the identity in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$.

(4) For an arbitrary element $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ the Fourier transform of the orbital integral Φ_X is represented by a locally constant function $\widehat{\mu}_X$ supported on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$:

$$\Phi_X(\widehat{f}) = \int_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})} f(g)\widehat{\mu}_X(g)\, dg$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$; the function $\widehat{\mu}_X$ is locally integrable on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, and the function $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\widehat{\mu}_X$ is locally bounded on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

(5) There exists a neighbourhood of the identity element in which the *local character expansion* holds:

$$\theta_\pi(\exp X) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} c_{\mathcal{O}} \widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X),$$

where $\mathcal{O}$ runs over the set of nilpotent orbits (which is finite), and $c_{\mathcal{O}}$ are complex coefficients (these coefficients are known to be rational in many cases, but we will not address this issue here).

Clozel [9] extended these results to the case of nonconnected $\mathbf{G}$, still in characteristic zero.

In positive characteristic, much less is known. First, we address the statements known for all reductive groups. It was proved by G. Prasad [2, Appendix B] for connected groups, and by J. Adler and J. Korman in general [4, Appendix] (the latter article also has a nice review of earlier results) that under mild hypotheses on $\mathbf{G}$ and the characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$, the statement (1) holds (we emphasize that this is the statement valid *only for the test functions f with support contained in* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$). Similarly for the Fourier transforms of orbital integrals, the locally constant function $\widehat{\mu}_X$ of (4) on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ exists, and the integral in (4) converges for the test functions f with support contained in $G(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ (see [16]). DeBacker [16] established the explicit neighbourhood of the validity of the local character expansion, and at the same time proved that (5) holds in positive characteristic under mild hypotheses on $\mathbf{G}$ and the characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$. (This result was extended by Adler and Korman [4] to a neighbourhood of an arbitrary semisimple element, also with just mild hypotheses on the characteristic).

For GL_n, the local integrability of characters (2) was proved by Rodier [37] for $p > n$, and by a different method, by B. Lemaire [30] for arbitrary p. Lemaire also proved the local integrability of characters for the inner forms of GL_n and SL_n, and for twisted characters of GL_n, [31], [32].

In this paper, we prove that the functions $\widehat{\mu}_X$ of (4) for nilpotent, as well as for regular semisimple, elements X are locally integrable on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ for the fields $\mathbb{K}$ of sufficiently large positive characteristic, under the assumption that $\mathbf{G}$ is connected and unramified. We also prove the local boundedness of the functions $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\widehat{\mu}_X$ (see Corollary 6.4 for the nilpotent elements, and Theorem 6.11 for the regular semisimple ones). Thanks to the results of [16], local integrability (respectively, local boundedness) of the Fourier transforms of the (normalized) nilpotent orbital integrals implies local integrability (respectively, local boundedness) in a neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathfrak{g}$, for the Fourier transforms of the (normalized) invariant distributions with support bounded modulo conjugation, see Theorem 6.13. Local integrability of characters near the identity (Theorem 6.8) follows as well, assuming the additional hypothesis, inherited from [16], on the existence of the so-called mock exponential map, which we review in 6.2.1.

Our approach is quite different from all earlier approaches: the main result we prove in this paper is Theorem 6.2, which states that when the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is sufficiently large, the Fourier transforms of nilpotent orbital integrals on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ belong to a certain class of functions, called *constructible motivic exponential functions*, defined by means of logic. We review the definitions in §2. For the functions of this class, there are the so-called *transfer principles* allowing to transfer the statements between positive characteristic and characteristic zero when the residue characteristic is large. The history of the transfer principles of this kind goes back to the work of Ax and Kochen [6]. One such transfer principle, proved by Cluckers and Loeser [12], was used in [14] to transfer the Fundamental Lemma from positive characteristic to characteristic zero.

In [15], we prove the "transfer principle for integrability", and "transfer principle for boundedness", which allows to transfer statements about *integrability* (respectively, boundedness) of functions. We observe that the earlier transfer principle of [12] had to do with transferring *equalities* between functions and their integrals. The transfer principles proved in [15], combined with our Theorem 6.2, allow us to transfer the statement about local integrability of the function representing the Fourier transform of a nilpotent orbital integral to the positive characteristic case from the characteristic zero case, as well as the corresponding statement about local boundedness.

Before we can discuss our results in some detail, let us first establish the notation that will be used throughout the paper. We fix a global field E with the ring of integers Ω (unfortunately, the standard by now notation used in motivic integration has accidental overlaps with the notation used in [27] which became standard in harmonic analysis; hence, our notation here differs from both that of [27] and [15]; we hope that it causes no confusion). Let $\mathcal{A}_\Omega$ be the collection of all non-Archimedean local fields $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic zero, with a ring homomorphism $\Omega \to \mathbb{K}$, and with a uniformizer $\varpi_\mathbb{K}$ of $\Omega_\mathbb{K}$, where $\Omega_\mathbb{K}$ stands for the ring of integers of $\mathbb{K}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ be the collection of all local fields $\mathbb{K}$ of positive characteristic with a ring homomorphism $\Omega \to \mathbb{K}$, with a uniformizer $\varpi_\mathbb{K}$ of $\Omega_\mathbb{K}$. The notation $\mathbb{K}$ will always stand for a local field that lies in $\mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$. For an integer $M > 0$, we will also often use the collections $\mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$ of fields in $\mathcal{A}_\Omega$ and $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ respectively, with residue characteristic greater than M.

We use Denef-Pas language with coefficients in Ω – this is a first-order language of logic; roughly speaking, formulas in this language define subsets of affine spaces over the local fields $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$. For a discretely valued field $\mathbb{K}$, its ring of integers will be denoted by $\Omega_\mathbb{K}$, the maximal ideal – by $\mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{K}$, and the residue field – by $k_\mathbb{K}$.

In [14], Cluckers, Hales and Loeser explained how the construction of unramified reductive p-adic groups can be carried out within the Denef-Pas language: namely, for an unramified root datum, there exists a formula in Denef-Pas language defining a connected reductive algebraic group $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ for every $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ with sufficiently large residue characteristic, and the root datum of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ is the given one. We give a brief review of this construction in §3.1. We rely on this construction of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ via a formula in Denef-Pas language as the starting point, and this is one of the reasons we assume that **G** is unramified and connected; additionally, all our arguments related to the building are much simplified by the assumption that **G** is unramified; we believe, however, that it should be possible to remove these assumptions with more work. Once we have a field-independent construction of **G**, we check that all the ingredients appearing in DeBacker's parameterisation of the set of nilpotent orbits can be expressed in Denef-Pas language, and this ultimately leads to our main Theorem 6.2.

Acknowledgement. We are indebted to T.C. Hales, Jonathan Korman and Jyotsna Diwadkar, without whose influence this work could not have appeared in the present form. The second-named author is deeply grateful to Jeff Adler, Loren Spice and Clifton Cunningham for multiple helpful communications, and to Fiona Murnaghan for continued interest and encouragement. The third-named author was supported by the SFB 878 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; the second-named author was supported by NSERC.

2. Constructible motivic exponential functions

Here we recall briefly the main notions and notation used in motivic integration; we refer to the original articles [13], [12] for complete details, and to [11], [23], and especially [14] for exposition.

2.1. **Denef-Pas language and definable subassignments.** Denef-Pas language is a first order language of logic designed for working with valued fields. The formulas in this language can have variables of three sorts: the valued field sort, the residue field sort, and the value group sort (in our setting, the value group is always assumed to be $\mathbb{Z}$, so we will call this sort the $\mathbb{Z}$-sort). Here is the list of symbols used to denote operations and binary relations in this language:

- In the valued field sort: $+$ and $\times$ for the binary operations of addition and multiplication; $\mathrm{ord}(\cdot)$ for the valuation (it is a function from the valued field sort to the $\mathbb{Z}$-sort), and $\overline{\mathrm{ac}}(\cdot)$ for the so-called angular component – a function from the valued field sort to the residue field sort (more about this function below).
- In the residue field sort: $+$ and $\times$ for addition and multiplication.
- In the $\mathbb{Z}$-sort: $+$ for addition; the binary relations $\geq$, and $\equiv_n$ for the congruence modulo n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- There is also the binary relation $=$ in every sort.

Initially, the symbols for the constants are just 0 and 1 in every sort, and the symbol ∞ in the $\mathbb{Z}$-sort to denote the valuation of 0 (with the natural rules with respect to ∞ and all the operations and relations, such as $\infty \geq n$ is true for all n, etc.). However, we will use Denef-Pas language with coefficients in $\Omega[\![t]\!]$ in the valued field sort. This means that a symbol is formally added to the valued field sort for every element of $\Omega[\![t]\!]$. We denote this language by $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$.

The formulas in $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$ are built from the symbols for variables in every sort and constant symbols, using the listed above operations and relations, and conjunction, disjunction, negation, and the quantifiers $\forall$ and $\exists$.

Given a valued field $\mathbb{K}$ that is an algebra over Ω *with the choice of the uniformizer of the valuation* ϖ, one can interpret the formulas in $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$ by letting the variables range, respectively, over $\mathbb{K}$, the residue field $k_\mathbb{K}$ of $\mathbb{K}$, and $\mathbb{Z}$ (which is the value group of $\mathbb{K}$). The function symbols $\operatorname{ord}(x)$ and $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x)$ are interpreted as follows: $\operatorname{ord}(x)$ denotes the valuation of x, and $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x)$ denotes the so-called angular component of x: if x is a unit, then $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x)$ is the residue of x modulo ϖ (thus, an element of the residue field); for a general $x \neq 0$ define $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x) = \overline{\operatorname{ac}}(\varpi^{-\operatorname{ord}(x)}x)$; thus, $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x)$ is the first non-zero coefficient of the ϖ-adic expansion of x. By definition, $\overline{\operatorname{ac}}(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.

In this way, any formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots z_r)$ with n free (that is, not bound by quantifiers) variables of the valued field sort, m free variables of the residue field sort, and r free variables of the $\mathbb{Z}$-sort yields a subset of $\mathbb{K}^n \times k_\mathbb{K}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^r$, namely those points $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots z_r) \in \mathbb{K}^n \times k_\mathbb{K}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ where ϕ takes the value "true". Sets of this form for some $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$-formula ϕ are called *definable*. A function is called definable if its graph is a definable set.

Let us (temporarily) denote the category of fields L which admit an injective ring homomorphism from Ω to L by $\underline{\mathrm{Flds}}_\Omega$. We write $h[n, m, r]$ for the functor from $\underline{\mathrm{Flds}}_\Omega$ to $\underline{\mathrm{Sets}}$ which sends L to $L((t))^n \times L^m \times \mathbb{Z}^r$. Any formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots z_r)$ as above in particular induces a map which sends any $L \in \underline{\mathrm{Flds}}_\Omega$ to a subset of $L((t))^n \times L^m \times \mathbb{Z}^r$. A map which is obtained in this way from an $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$-formula is called a *definable subassignment of* $h[n, m, r]$ (or simply a *definable subassignment* if we do not want to specify n, m, r). A similar notion was first introduced in [19].

A morphism of definable subassignments consists of a family of maps between the corresponding definable sets for each $L \in \underline{\mathrm{Flds}}_\Omega$, such that the family of graphs of these maps is a definable subassignment.

Definition 2.1. The category of definable (in the language $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$) subassignments of $h[n, m, r]$ with some integers $n, m, r \geq 0$ is denoted by Def. The category of definable subassignments of $h[0, m, 0]$ for some $m > 0$ is denoted by RDef (thus, the subassignments in RDef are defined by formulas that can *only* have free variables of the residue field sort).

We will also need the "relative" situation: suppose $S \in \mathrm{Def}$ is a definable subassignment. Then one can define Def_S – the category of definable subassignments over S – to be the category of definable subassignments with a fixed morphism to S (with morphisms, naturally, defined to be morphisms over S). The category RDef_S consists of subassignments of $S \times h[0, n, 0]$ with the projection onto the first coordinate as the fixed morphism to S. If X is a definable subassignment, we write $X[m, n, r]$ for $X \times h[m, n, r]$.

2.2. **Specialization.** The main point of using the language $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$ is *specialization*, which we survey briefly, while referring to [11, §6.7] or [23, §5] for a better exposition. Recall the notation $\mathcal{A}_\Omega$ and $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ defined in the introduction ($\mathcal{A}_\Omega$ is the collection of completions of algebraic extensions of the base field E, thus its objects are fields of characteristic zero, and $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ is the collection of positive-characteristic fields that admit a homomorphism from Ω) – these are the collections of fields to which we would like to apply a transfer principle.

Let S be a definable subassignment of $h[n, m, r]$ for some m, n, and r; suppose that S is defined by an $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$-formula ϕ. Let $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ be a discretely valued field, with a choice of the uniformizer of the valuation ϖ. Then the formula ϕ can be interpreted in $\mathbb{K}$ to give a subset $S_\mathbb{K}$ of $\mathbb{K}^n \times k_\mathbb{K}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^r$. The set $S_\mathbb{K}$ is called the *specialization* of the subassignment S to $\mathbb{K}$.

For two formulas ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 defining the same subassignment S, there exists a constant M, such that for $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$ their specializations to $\mathbb{K}$ give the same set regardless of which formula we use. We emphasize that a definable subassignment can be specialized *both* to the fields of characteristic zero and those of positive characteristic, and the specialization is well defined as long as the residue characteristic is sufficiently large.

2.3. **Motivic exponential functions.** For a definable subassignment X, the ring of the so-called *constructible motivic functions* on X, denoted by $\mathscr{C}(X)$, is defined in [13]. The elements of $\mathscr{C}(X)$ are, essentially, formal constructions defined using the language $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$. For the sake of brevity (and consistency with [15]), we will drop the word "constructible" everywhere from now on, and refer to the elements of $\mathscr{C}(X)$ as "motivic functions". The main feature of motivic functions is specialization to functions on definable subsets of affine spaces over discretely valued fields. Namely, let $F \in \mathscr{C}(X)$. Let $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ be a non-Archimedean local field. Let ϖ be the uniformizer of the valuation on $\mathbb{K}$. Then the motivic function F specializes to a $\mathbb{Q}$-valued function $F_\mathbb{K}$ on $X_\mathbb{K}$, for all fields $\mathbb{K}$ of residue characteristic bigger than a constant that depends only on the $\mathcal{L}_\Omega$-formulas defining F and X. As explained in [14, §2.9], one can tensor the ring $\mathscr{C}(X)$ with $\mathbb{C}$, and then the specializations $F_\mathbb{K}$ of elements of $\mathscr{C}(X) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ form a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra of functions on $X_\mathbb{K}$, which we will denote by $\mathscr{C}_\mathbb{K}(X_\mathbb{K})$. See [15, §4.2.5] for a general form of a motivic function.

Further, for a subassignment X as above, the ring of motivic constructible exponential functions $\mathscr{C}^{\exp}(X)$ is defined in [12]. The elements of this ring specialize to what we will call (p-adic) constructible exponential functions. In the motivic setting, we will also drop the word "constructible" from now on. In order to get a specialization of a motivic exponential function, one needs to choose, in addition to a local field $\mathbb{K}$ with uniformizer ϖ, an additive character Λ of $\mathbb{K}$ satisfying the condition

$$\Lambda(x) = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{p}\mathrm{Tr}_{k_{\mathbb{K}}}(\bar{x})\right) \tag{1}$$

for $x \in \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}$. Here, p is the characteristic of $k_{\mathbb{K}}$, $\bar{x} \in k_{\mathbb{K}}$ is the reduction of x modulo ϖ, and $\mathrm{Tr}_{k_{\mathbb{K}}}$ is the trace of $k_{\mathbb{K}}$ over its prime subfield (see [15, §§4.1, 4.2.6] for details). The set of characters of $\mathbb{K}$ satisfying the condition (1) will be denoted by $\mathscr{D}_{\mathbb{K}}$.

Given a field $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ as above, with a uniformizer ϖ and an additive character Λ as in (1), we will consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra of functions on $X_{\mathbb{K}}$ generated by the specializations of motivic exponential functions. As above, we can tensor it with $\mathbb{C}$; we denote the resulting $\mathbb{C}$-algebra by $\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{exp}}_{\mathbb{K},\Lambda}(X_{\mathbb{K}})$. See [15, §4.2.9, §3.2] for details.

We will often need to talk about motivic (respectively, motivic exponential) functions on the set of $\mathbb{K}$-points of an algebraic group $\mathbf{G}$ or its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. We observe that any affine algebraic variety V (for example, $V = \mathbf{G}$ or $V = \mathfrak{g}$) naturally gives a definable subassignment of $h[m, 0, 0]$ with some m; let us for the moment denote this subassignment by $\tilde{V}$. Then $\tilde{V}_{\mathbb{K}} = V(\mathbb{K})$, for all non-Archimedean local fields $\mathbb{K}$ of sufficiently large residue characteristic. However, to keep notation simple, we will simply talk about motivic functions on $V(\mathbb{K})$ for a variety V, implying that we replace $V(\mathbb{K})$ with $\tilde{V}_{\mathbb{K}}$; it is in this sense that we talk about motivic functions on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ or $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ below.

In [13], Cluckers and Loeser defined a class $\mathrm{I}C(X)$ of *integrable* motivic functions, which is closed under integration with respect to parameters (where integration is with respect to the *motivic measure*). Given a local field $\mathbb{K}$ with a choice of the uniformizer, these functions specialize to integrable (in the classical sense) functions on $X_{\mathbb{K}}$, and motivic integration specializes to the classical integration with respect to an appropriately normalized Haar measure, when the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is sufficiently large. In [12] the definition of "integrable" and the notion of motivic integration are extended to motivic *exponential* functions. Moreover, there is a notion of "motivic" Fourier transform that specializes to the classical Fourier transform.

2.3.1. *Convention.* For the sake of brevity, we will use the term "motivic (exponential) function" a little loosely, in the sense that we will sometimes refer to a p-adic function by this collection of adjectives if it is obtained by specialization from a motivic exponential function. Precisely, we say that a function f on some subset of an affine space over a non-Archimedean local field $\mathbb{K}$ is a motivic (exponential) function if the following conditions hold:

1. the domain of f is a specialization $S_{\mathbb{K}}$ of some definable subassignment $S \in \mathrm{Def}$; and
2. there exists a motivic motivic (exponential) function F on S, and in the case when "exponential" is relevant, an additive character $\Lambda \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathbb{K}}$, such that $f = F_{\mathbb{K}}$ (respectively, $f = F_{\mathbb{K},\Lambda}$).

A similar convention applies to integration and Fourier transform: namely, when we integrate the specialization of a motivic exponential function (with respect to a p-adic Haar measure), we think of the integral as the specialization of the corresponding motivic integral.

In contexts where we allow $\mathbb{K}$ to vary, we will assume that the definable subassignment S and the motivic (exponential) function F do not depend on $\mathbb{K}$.

2.4. **Motivic exponential functions and representatives.** As noted briefly in §2.2 above, and explained in [15] in detail, the specialization of a subassignment (and therefore, of a motivic exponential function) depends, in principle, on the choice of specific formulas used to define the subassignment and the function in question. Given one such choice of formulas, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that for the fields $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$, the specialization to $\mathbb{K}$ is well defined. In [15], the choice of formulas is referred to as "the choice of representatives", meaning that a subassignment is thought of as an equivalence class of formulas.

We observe that in this paper (as well as in all applications of motivic integration so far) whenever we prove that a certain object or function is "motivic", it automatically comes with a collection of formulas defining it; that is, the motivic objects always appear with the choice of representatives in the sense of [15, §4.2.2] (we emphasize again that the choice of representatives amounts to a choice of specific formulas defining the given subassignment). Since all our definable objects come with a choice of formulas defining them, we can assume that this is the choice of representatives built into all the constants that provide the lower bounds on residue characteristic in all our results.

2.5. **Transfer of integrability and boundedness.** We quote the transfer of integrability and transfer of boundedness principles from [15]. (For simplicity, we quote the version without parameters, that is, we take X to be a point in [15, Theorem 4.4.1] and [15, Theorem 4.4.2]).

Theorem 2.2. [15, Theorem 4.4.1] *Let F be a motivic exponential function on $h[n,0,0]$. Then there exists $M > 0$, such that for the fields $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$, the truth of the statement that $F_{\mathbb{K},\Lambda}$ is (locally) integrable for all $\Lambda \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathbb{K}}$ depends only on the isomorphism class of the residue field of $\mathbb{K}$.*

Theorem 2.3. [15, Theorem 4.4.2] *Let F be a motivic exponential function on $h[n,0,0]$. Then, for some $M > 0$, for the fields $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$, the truth of the statement that $F_{\mathbb{K},\Lambda}$ is (locally) bounded for all $\Lambda \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathbb{K}}$ depends only on the isomorphism class of the residue field of $\mathbb{K}$.*

The main goal of this paper is to prove that Fourier transforms of nilpotent orbital integrals are represented on the set of regular elements by motivic exponential functions. Then the transfer principles will apply, yielding local integrability (respectively, local boundedness) for $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$ for large M.

3. Root data and Moy-Prasad filtrations

In this section, we do much of the technical work in preparation for proving that orbital integrals are motivic functions. We describe the set up for working with unramified reductive groups in Denef-Pas language, briefly discuss the building and Moy-Prasad filtrations, and ultimately prove that the sets $\mathfrak{g}_r$ (whose definition is recalled below) are definable. We also prove that reductive quotients are definable, in preparation for the discussion of the classification of nilpotent orbits.

3.1. **Unramified reductive groups.** For the moment, let $\mathbb{K}$ be a fixed non-Archimedean local field. Let $\mathbf{G}$ be a connected reductive group over $\mathbb{K}$. We say that $\mathbf{G}$ is unramified if it is quasi-split and splits over an unramified extension of $\mathbb{K}$. We follow [14] in the treatment of the root data and definability of the group $\mathbf{G}$ and its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, and much of this section is almost directly quoted from [14] – we include the extensive quote because it provides the basic notation and set-up that will be used throughout this paper.

First, we recall from [14, §3] that every time we need to consider an unramified degree l extension of $\mathbb{K}$, we introduce a parameter $a \in \mathbb{K}$ satisfying the conditions that a is a unit, and the polynomial $x^l - a$ is irreducible. Both of these conditions are definable in Denef-Pas language. The splitting field of the polynomial $x^l - a$ is an unramified degree l extension of $\mathbb{K}$; this field can be identified with $\mathbb{K}^l$ via the explicit basis $\{1, x, \dots, x^{l-1}\}$ of $\mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)$. The Frobenius automorphism then can be represented by an $l \times l$-matrix. Therefore, from now on we can use unramified extensions of fixed degree and their Galois automorphisms in formulas in Denef-Pas language, using a as a parameter (see below for details).

Split reductive groups $\mathbf{G}$ are classified by the root data $\Psi = (X_*, \Phi, X^*, \Phi^\vee)$ consisting of the character group of a split maximal torus $\mathbf{T}$ in $\mathbf{G}$, the set of roots, the cocharacter group, and the set of coroots. The set of possible root data of this form is completely field-independent. We observe that split reductive groups are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Following [14, §4], we fix, once and for all, a faithful rational representation

$$\rho_\Psi : \mathbf{G} \to \mathbf{GL}(V),$$

attached to the root datum Ψ (where $\mathbf{G}$ is the group with the root datum Ψ, and V is some finite-dimensional vector space; we fix a basis of V over $\mathbb{Q}$). Then the image of ρ_Ψ is defined by a formula ϕ_Ψ in Denef-Pas language (with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$). Let n denote the dimension of V. When the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is large enough, the group defined by the specialization of ϕ_Ψ to $\mathbb{K}$ has the root datum Ψ (depending on the type of Ψ, at this stage we may have to exclude the residue characteristics 2 and 3). Similarly, for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of $\mathbf{G}$, we use the differential of the representation ρ_Ψ to identify $\mathfrak{g}$ with a definable subassignment of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$.

Isomorphism classes of unramified connected reductive groups are in bijection with the set of (natural isomorphism classes of) pairs (Ψ, θ), where Ψ is a root datum as above, and θ is an automorphism of Ψ preserving a set of simple roots in Φ. Let $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ be the split group with the root datum Ψ. Then the unramified group $\mathbf{G}$ corresponding to (Ψ, θ) is a twist of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$, obtained as follows. Suppose that θ has order l. Let $\mathbb{K}_l$ be an unramified extension of $\mathbb{K}$ of degree l. Let $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}, \{x_\alpha\})$ be a splitting of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ (defined over $\mathbb{Q}$). The automorphism θ of the root datum determines a unique automorphism of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ preserving the splitting (we will denote this automorphism of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ by θ as well). For any $\mathbb{K}$-algebra L, the group $\mathbf{G}(L)$ is the set of fixed points of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_l)$ under the map $\theta \circ \tau$, where τ is the extension of the Frobenius automorphism of $\mathbb{K}_l$ over $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_l)$. Using the representation ρ_Ψ of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$, the fixed-point condition can be expressed by a language of rings formula in the matrix entries of an element of $\rho_\Psi(\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}_l))$; we also recall that we replace elements of $\mathbb{K}_l$ with l-tuples of elements of $\mathbb{K}$, and use the extra parameter a that determines the extension $\mathbb{K}_l$.

We quote the conclusion from [14, §4.2]:

For every pair (Ψ, θ) (and a fixed ρ_Ψ) there exists a formula $\phi_{\Psi,\theta}$ in the Denef-Pas language with $1 + l^2 + n^2 l$ free variables such that for any p-adic field $\mathbb{K}$ the formula $\phi_{\Psi,\theta}(a, \tau, g)$ has the value "true" precisely when a is a unit such that $x^l - a$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{K}$, $\mathbb{K}_l = \mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)$, $\tau \in \mathbf{M}_l(\mathbb{K})$ is a generator of the Galois group of $\mathbb{K}_l$ over $\mathbb{K}$, and $g \in \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{K}_l)$ is identified with an element $g \in \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ (under the identification of $\mathbb{K}^l$ with $\mathbb{K}_l$ determined by a).

Thus, $\mathbf{G}$ is a subassignment of $h[n^2 l + l^2 + 1, 0, 0]$, where n is the degree of the representation ρ_Ψ of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ (*i.e.*, the matrix size of the elements of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ in the case of classical groups), and l is the order of θ. However, we need to be slightly more precise about $\mathbf{G}$ – we would like to remember the canonical projection from $\mathbf{G}$ onto the (a, τ)-coordinates, *i.e.*, we would like to think of $\mathbf{G}$ as an object in the relative category Def_{S_l} for an appropriate subassignment S_l.

Given l, first let S_l^1 be the subassignment of $h[1, 0, 0]$ defined by the formula $\phi_1(a)$ stating that a is a unit, and the polynomial $x^l - a$ is irreducible. Now we fix the subassignment S_l of $S_l^1[l^2, 0, 0]$ that, for a given field $\mathbb{K}$ with a uniformizer ϖ, specializes to the set of pairs $(a, \tau) \in \mathbb{K}^{l^2+1}$, where a is the unit in $\mathbb{K}$ such that the polynomial $x^l - a$ is irreducible, and τ is the matrix of a generator of the Galois group of $\mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)$ over $\mathbb{K}$, as above. Now we can think of the subassignment $\mathbf{G}$ equipped with the projection to the first $l^2 + 1$ coordinates as an element of Def_{S_l}.

Remark 3.1. There is a slightly different way to think of the subassignment $\mathbf{G}$ – namely, as the set of $\theta \circ \tau$-fixed points of the "base change" of the subassignment $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ from $h[0, 0, 0]$ to S_l. More precisely, we can define an object in the category of subassignments that corresponds to the base change from $\mathbb{K}$ to $\mathbb{K}_l$ of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ in the category of varieties. Let V be the subassignment of $S^1_l[n^2 l, 0, 0]$ such that $(V_L)_a = \mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}\left(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)\right)$ for every field L containing $\mathbb{K}$ and for every point $a \in (S^1_l)_L$ (we refer to [13, §2.6] for details on points and fibres of definable subassignments). Note that such a definable subassignment exists: each fibre over a corresponds to the variety $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}} \times_{\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{K}} \operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)$, (see also [13, §2.5]). Now let $U = V \times_{S^1_l} S_l$, and let $\mathbf{G}$ be defined by taking the set of $\theta \circ \tau$-fixed points in the fibre of U over (a, τ), for every $(a, \tau) \in S_l$.

From now on, in the case when the group $\mathbf{G}$ splits over an unramified degree l extension, we will always work in the relative category Def_{S_l}; we will refer to this situation as "the non-split case".

As explained in [14, §9.2], by varying the parameter a in S^1_l, we get isomorphic groups $\mathbf{G}$; for a fixed a, different choices of the generator τ might correspond to non-isomorphic data (Ψ, θ) and (Ψ, θ'), where θ and θ' generate the same group of automorphisms of the root datum Ψ. In this sense, in the non-split case, we prove all the results not for an individual algebraic group $\mathbf{G}$, but for the collection of groups $\mathbf{G}'$ defined by the root data (Ψ, θ') as above.

3.2. **Bruhat-Tits building.**

Here we follow the notation of [17] as much as possible.

Let $(\Psi, \theta) = (X^*, \Phi, X_*, \Phi^\vee, \theta)$ be the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a maximally split torus, and suppose it splits over the unramified extension $\mathbb{K}_l$ of $\mathbb{K}$ of degree l (*i.e.*, θ has order l). Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ denote the (enlarged) building of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$.

In this paper, we will only need to use an alcove in some fixed apartment A. We consider the case when $\mathbf{G}$ is split over $\mathbb{K}$ first. In this case, $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{T}$ is a maximal torus. We fix the apartment $A = A(\mathbf{T}) = X_* \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Let $\tilde{\Phi} = \{\delta + n \mid \delta \in \Phi, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ – this is the set of affine roots. One can think of the elements of $\tilde{\Phi}$ as functions on the apartment, via the formula

$$(\delta + n)(\sum_i \lambda_i \otimes r_i) := n + \sum_i \langle \delta, \lambda_i \rangle r_i,$$

where $\sum_i \lambda_i \otimes r_i$ is an element of $X_* \otimes \mathbb{R}$, and $\langle , \rangle$ denotes the usual pairing between characters and cocharacters. Thus, for every element $\psi \in \tilde{\Phi}$, we can define a hyperplane

$$H_\psi = \{x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T}) \mid \psi(x) = 0\}.$$

The hyperplanes H_ψ provide a simplicial decomposition of the affine space $A(\mathbf{T})$. The maximal facets of this simplicial decomposition are called *alcoves* of $A(\mathbf{T})$. We will use the closure $\bar{C}$ of an alcove C in $A(\mathbf{T})$. Let $\tilde{W}$ be the group generated by reflections in the hyperplanes H_ψ.

Note that $\bar{C}$ is a simplicial set. We will need only the following information about it:

1. the list of its faces;
2. incidence relations between the faces;

(3) the orbits of the action of $\tilde{W}$ on the set of faces of $\bar{C}$;
(4) a certain finite set of points in $\bar{C}$, called *optimal points*, discussed in the next subsection.

For now we focus on the data (1)–(3) for the alcove. We observe that this information is uniquely determined by the root datum Ψ (*i.e.*, is independent of the field $\mathbb{K}$).

If $\mathbf{G}$ is not split, we first consider $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K}_l)$. The Frobenius automorphism acts on X_* via $\theta \circ \tau$, and this gives rise to the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$ on $A(\mathbf{T}, \mathbb{K}_l)$, which we will continue denoting by $\theta \circ \tau$. Since $\mathbb{K}_l$ is an unramified extension, $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ can be identified with the set of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-fixed points of $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K}_l)$. In this case, there exists a torus $\mathbf{T}$ that splits over $\mathbb{K}_l$, such that the apartment $A(\mathbf{S}, \mathbb{K})$ is identified with the set of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-fixed points of $A(\mathbf{T}, \mathbb{K}_l)$. Let $\bar{C}$ be a closed alcove in $A(\mathbf{T}, \mathbb{K}_l)$ such that the set $\bar{C}^{\theta\circ\tau}$ of its $\theta \circ \tau$-fixed points contains an alcove of $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$. In the non-split case the set $\bar{C}^{\theta\circ\tau}$ plays the same role as the closure of an alcove $\bar{C}$ in the split case.

Again we observe that the simplicial subset $\bar{C}^{\theta\circ\tau}$ of $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K}_l)$ is determined by the root datum Ψ, and the Frobenius action comes from a fixed permutation of its vertices. Thus, in all the cases that we are considering, the set of facets of an alcove $\bar{C}$ (respectively, of $\bar{C}^{\theta\circ\tau}$ in the non-split case) depends only on the root datum (Ψ, θ). We denote this finite set (equipped with an incidence relation and an action of $\tilde{W}$) by $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$.

Now let us turn to the set of optimal points. We claim that it can also be pre-computed from the root datum.

3.2.1. *Optimal points.* In [33, §6.1], Moy and Prasad define the set $\mathcal{O}$ of the so-called optimal points; we will denote this set by $\mathfrak{P}$, since the notation $\mathcal{O}$ is reserved for the orbits.

Let C be the alcove that gave rise to the set $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$. Let Σ be the set of affine roots $\psi \in \tilde{\Phi}$ that satisfy $\psi|_C > 0$, $(\psi - 1)|_C < 0$. This is a finite set that depends only on the root datum Ψ. We recall that the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$ is given by a permutation of the roots which we consider as part of the datum (Ψ, θ); this extends to the action on the affine roots; hence, there is a finite collection, which we will denote by $\mathfrak{C}_\Sigma$, of the $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-invariant subsets $\mathfrak{S}$ of Σ, and this collection depends only on the root datum (Ψ, θ). Let $\mathfrak{S} \subset \Sigma$ be an element of $\mathfrak{C}_\Sigma$.

Now we quote [2, §2.3], where it is stated that there exists a point $x_{\mathfrak{S}} \in \bar{C}$ such that:

(i) $\min_{\psi\in\mathfrak{S}} \psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}}) \geq \min_{\psi\in\mathfrak{S}} \psi(y)$ for all $y \in \bar{C}$;
(ii) $\psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is rational for all $\psi \in \tilde{\Phi}$;
(iii) $\psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-invariant.

We observe that for the future constructions, we do not need the point $x_{\mathfrak{S}}$ itself, but rather the tuple of its "baricentric coordinates" $(\psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}}))_{\psi\in\Sigma}$. As pointed out in [33, §6.1], finding optimal points is a problem of linear programming. The input for this problem is the field-independent set of affine roots Σ; thus the output is also a field-independent tuple of rational coordinates $\psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}})$.

We denote by $\mathfrak{P}_\Psi$ the set

$$\mathfrak{P}_\Psi = \{(\psi(x_{\mathfrak{S}}))_{\psi\in\Sigma}\}_{\mathfrak{S}\in\mathfrak{C}_\Sigma}.$$

3.3. **Moy-Prasad filtrations.** In [33], Moy and Prasad associate with each pair (x, r), where $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ and $r \geq 0$, (respectively, $r \in \mathbb{R}$):

- subgroups $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+} \subset \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, for $r \geq 0$;
- lattices $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+} \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, for $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

When $r = 0$, it is omitted from the notation; thus by definition, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_x = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,0}$, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_x^+ = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,0^+}$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_x = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,0}$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_x^+ = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,0^+}$. The groups $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_x$ and $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_x^+$ and the corresponding lattices in the Lie algebra depend only on the facet that contains the point x. Therefore, for a facet F we will denote them by $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_F$, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_F^+$, and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F^+$, respectively.

We recall the definition (this version is quoted from [2], see also [18]). First, for any torus $\mathbf{T}$ defined over $\mathbb{K}$, and for any extension L of $\mathbb{K}$, define, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathfrak{t}(L)_r := \{H \in \mathfrak{t}(L) \mid \mathrm{ord}(d\chi(H)) \geq r \text{ for all } \chi \in X^*(\mathbf{T})\}.$$

Now, recall that the torus $\mathbf{T}$ splits over an unramified extension, and this allows us to define the filtration subgroups of $\mathbf{T}(\mathbb{K})$ simply as follows: for $r \geq 0$, let

$$\mathbf{T}(L)_r := \{t \in \mathbf{T}(L) \mid \mathrm{ord}(\chi(t) - 1) \geq r \text{ for all } \chi \in X^*(\mathbf{T})\}.$$

Similarly, define

$$\mathfrak{t}(L)_{r^+} := \{H \in \mathfrak{t}(L) \mid \mathrm{ord}(d\chi(H)) > r \text{ for all } \chi \in X^*(\mathbf{T})\};$$
$$\mathbf{T}(L)_{r^+} := \{t \in \mathbf{T}(L) \mid \mathrm{ord}(\chi(t) - 1) > r \text{ for all } \chi \in X^*(\mathbf{T})\}.$$

Suppose for the moment that $\mathbf{G}$ is split, and fix the splitting $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}, \{x_\alpha\})$, defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. This splitting gives a well-defined subgroup $G_0 = \mathbf{G}(\Omega_{\mathbb{K}})$ of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$. Let U_α be the one-parameter subgroup corresponding to x_α: $U_\alpha = 1 + \mathbb{K}x_\alpha$. Let $\psi = \alpha + n \in \tilde{\Phi}$ be an affine root. Define

$$U_\psi = \{g \in U_\alpha \mid g = 1 + tx_\alpha, \quad \mathrm{ord}(t) \geq n\}.$$

Note that $U_{\alpha+0} = U_\alpha \cap G_0$. Similarly, one can define $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. Finally, let $x \in A(\mathbf{T}, \mathbb{K})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Then one can define

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r} = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_r \oplus \sum_{\{\psi\in\tilde{\Phi} \mid \psi(x)\geq r\}} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi$$
$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+} = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_{r^+} \oplus \sum_{\{\psi\in\tilde{\Phi} \mid \psi(x)> r\}} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi.$$

Similarly for the group, for $r \geq 0$, define $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ as the subgroup of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ generated by $\mathbf{T}(\mathbb{K})_r$ and the subgroups U_ψ with $\psi(x) \geq r$, and $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+}$ as the subgroup of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ generated by $\mathbf{T}(\mathbb{K})_{r^+}$ and the subgroups U_ψ with $\psi(x) > r$.

For a non-split group, suppose $x \in A(\mathbf{S}, \mathbb{K})$. In this case x can be realized as a $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-fixed point of $A(\mathbf{T}, \mathbb{K}_l)$, where $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal $\mathbb{K}_l$-split torus in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}_l)$ containing $\mathbf{S}$. For $r \geq 0$, the subgroup $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ is defined to be the group of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-fixed points of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}_l)_{x,r}$. Similarly, for $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ is defined to be the lattice of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$-fixed points of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_{x,r}$, and similarly, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+}$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+}$ are defined as the fixed points of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}_l)_{x,r^+}$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_{x,r^+}$, respectively.

Definition 3.2. Define

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r := \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G},\mathbb{K})} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r := \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G},\mathbb{K})} \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}.$$

Then the sets $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$ and $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r$ are open and closed, and are both $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-domains.

3.3.1. *Reductive quotients.* Given a facet F in $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$, one can form the quotients

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F := \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F/\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{G}_F := \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_F/\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_F^+.$$

Let $\mathfrak{r}_F : \mathfrak{g}_F \to \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ be the quotient map.

As defined here, $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ and $\bar{G}_F$ are just sets; however, it turns out that $\bar{G}_F$ is the set of $k_{\mathbb{K}}$-rational points of a reductive group $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_F$ defined over $k_{\mathbb{K}}$, and $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ is its Lie algebra over $k_{\mathbb{K}}$ (see [33, §3.2], [7, §3.1]).

3.4. **Definability.** Here we collect some basic statements about definability (in Denef-Pas language) of the parahoric subgroups (respectively, the corresponding lattices in the Lie algebra) defined above, and their reductive quotients.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathbf{G}$ be an unramified connected reductive algebraic group with the root datum (Ψ, θ) and the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Then*

1. *For every facet $F \in \bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$, the sets $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F^+$ are definable, in the sense that there exist definable subassignments, which will be denoted by $\mathfrak{g}_F$ and $\mathfrak{g}_F^+$, such that*
$$\mathfrak{g}_{F,\mathbb{K}} = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F, \quad \mathfrak{g}_{F,\mathbb{K}}^+ = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F^+,$$
for $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$ for some M (which depends only on the root datum (Ψ, θ)).
2. *The Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_{\mathbb{K}})$ is a specialization of a definable subassignment in RDef (which will also be denoted by $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$).*
3. *The quotient map $\mathfrak{r}_F : \mathfrak{g}_F \to \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ is a morphism of definable subassignments.*

Proof. Part (1). In the case $\mathfrak{g}$ is split over $\mathbb{K}$, this statement is Lemma 78 of [20].

In the non-split case, recall the notation from §3.1: $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ is the split form of $\mathbf{G}$; S_l is the subassignment that specializes to the set of pairs (a, τ) that determine the field extension $\mathbb{K}_l$ over which $\mathbf{G}$ splits, and the Galois group

$\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$; S_l^1 is the projection of S_l onto the first coordinate (it is a subassignment of the affine line $h[1,0,0]$).

To prove (1) in the case when $\mathfrak{g}$ is non-split, pass to the unramified extension $\mathbb{K}_l$ over which it splits. Let $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}$ be the Lie algebra of $\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$. The set $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F$ is the set of Galois-fixed points of the set $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{K}_l)_F = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_F$.

As in §3.1, we can base change $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}$ to $\mathbb{K}_l$, in the sense that we can make a subassignment, call it V, of $S_l^1[n^2l,0,0]$, such that for every field L containing $\mathbb{K}$, for every point $a \in (S_l^1)_L$, we have $(V_L)_a = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}\left(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)\right)$. By the split case (i.e., [20, Lemma 78]), there exists a definable subassignment W of V, such that

$$(W_L)_a = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}\left(L \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}[x]/(x^l - a)\right)_F$$

for all fields L containing $\mathbb{K}$, when $\mathbb{K}$ has sufficiently large residue characteristic. Now, consider the subassignment $W_1 := W \times_{S_l^1} S_l$ – the base change of W from S_l^1 to S_l, as discussed in §3.1. Over every point $(a,\tau) \in S_l$, there is a definable action $\theta \circ \tau$ of the generator of the Galois group on the fibre of W_1 at this point. Let W^T be the definable subassignment of W_1 in Def_{S_l} defined by taking the $\theta \circ \tau$-fixed points of W_1 in the fibre over every point $(a,\tau) \in S_l$. Thus, in the fibre over every point $(a,\tau) \in (S_l)_{\mathbb{K}}$, we have

$$(W^T)_{\mathbb{K}} = (\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{K})_F)^{\theta\circ\tau} = (\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_F)^{\theta\circ\tau} = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F.$$

A similar argument applies to $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{K}}^{+}$. This completes the proof of (1).

For Parts (2) and (3), we need to work with the reductive quotients. In order to define the reductive quotient as in [33], one needs to work with smooth group schemes constructed by Bruhat and Tits [8], or, alternatively, the smooth group schemes of [43]. For a fixed local field $\mathbb{K}$, these are schemes over $\Omega_{\mathbb{K}}$. We need a more explicit way to think about them in order to show that the reductive quotients depend on $\mathbb{K}$ only via the residue field. Since we are assuming that $\mathbf{G}$ is unramified, it is easy to reduce to the case of Chevalley groups, for which a convenient for our purposes exposition is given in [35].

Part (2). First, consider the case when $\mathfrak{g}$ is split. In this case, the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ is the set of $k_{\mathbb{K}}$-points of a generalized Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(k_{\mathbb{K}})$, which is also split, and whose root system is completely determined by F (see e.g., [35, Theorem 3.17]). Therefore, it can be thought of as a specialization of a definable subassignment in RDef, in the same way as described above in §3.1.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is not split, pass to the unramified extension $\mathbb{K}_l$ over which it splits. Since this extension is unramified, the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}(k_{\mathbb{K}})$ is the set of Frobenius-fixed points of the reductive quotient $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}(k_{\mathbb{K}_l})$ (where $k_{\mathbb{K}_l}$ is the residue field of $\mathbb{K}_l$). Then by the same argument as in §3.1, it is definable.

Part (3). Again, assume first that $\mathfrak{g}$ is split. Write $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{g}'$, where $\mathfrak{z}$ is the centre of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\mathfrak{g}'$ is semisimple. To show that the map $\mathfrak{r}_F$ is definable, we need to show that its graph is a definable subset of $\mathfrak{g}_F \times \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$.

Let (X, x) be a point on the graph of $\mathfrak{r}_F$, so that $\mathfrak{r}_F(X) = x \in \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_{\mathbb{K}})$. Recall that we have fixed the embedding $d\rho_\Psi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{gl}_n$. Recall also that we have the Chevalley basis $\{X_\alpha\}, \{H_\beta\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}'$, where α ranges over the set of roots Φ, β ranges over the set of simple roots Δ, and the homomorphisms $X_\alpha, H_\beta : \mathfrak{gl}_1 \to \mathfrak{g}$ are defined over $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}} = \varpi\Omega_{\mathbb{K}}$ be the maximal ideal in $\Omega_{\mathbb{K}}$. By [35, Theorem 3.17], the root system of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ (which we will denote by Φ_F) is a subset of the root system of $\mathfrak{g}$, and the generators $X_\alpha(t)$, $H_\beta(s)$ (with $t \in {\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}}^{-\alpha|F}$, $s \in \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}^\times$) of $\mathfrak{g}_F$ are mapped to the generators $\mathtt{X}_\alpha(\mathtt{t})$, $\mathtt{H}_\beta(\mathtt{s})$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$, with $\mathtt{t} \in k_{\mathbb{K}} \cong {\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}}^{-\alpha|F}/{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}}^{1-\alpha|F}$, $\mathtt{s} \in k_{\mathbb{K}}^\times \cong \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}^\times/(1+\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}})$ (here by $\alpha|F$ we denote the value of the root α on the facet F). The elements of the centre are treated the same way as those of the Cartan subalgebra: we denote by $Z_i(s)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, $s \in \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}^\times$ an arbitrary system of generators of $\mathfrak{z}$ (over $\mathbb{Z}$); they project under $\mathfrak{r}_F$ to the generators $\mathtt{Z}_\mathtt{i}(\mathtt{s})$, where $\mathtt{s} = \overline{\mathrm{ac}}(s)$.

Then the point $(X, x) \in \mathfrak{g}_F \times \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ lies on the graph of the map $\mathfrak{r}_F$ if and only if it satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_F(X,x) = \text{‘}&\exists Y \in \mathfrak{g}_F^+,\ \exists W \in \mathfrak{g}_F,\ \exists Z \in \mathfrak{z}, \quad \text{such that } X = Y + W + Z,\\
&\exists t_\alpha \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}^{-\alpha|_F} \text{ for } \alpha \in \Phi_F, \quad \exists s_\beta \in \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}^\times \text{ for } \beta \in \Delta,\\
&\exists u_i \in \Omega_{\mathbb{K}}^\times \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r,\\
&\text{so that:}\\
&W = \sum_{\alpha\in\Phi_F} X_\alpha(t_\alpha) + \sum_{\beta\in\Delta} H_\beta(s_\beta),\\
&Z = \sum_{i=1}^{r} Z_i(u_i),\\
&x = \sum_{\alpha\in\Phi_F} \mathtt{X}_\alpha(\mathtt{t}_\alpha) + \sum_{\beta\in\Delta} \mathtt{H}_\beta(\mathtt{s}_\beta) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \mathtt{Z}_i(\mathtt{u}_i)\\
&\text{with } \mathtt{t}_\alpha = \overline{\mathrm{ac}}(t_\alpha), \mathtt{s}_\beta = \overline{\mathrm{ac}}(s_\beta), \mathtt{u}_i = \overline{\mathrm{ac}}(u_i).\text{’}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, in the case $\mathfrak{g}$ is not split, since we are assuming it splits over an unramified extension $\mathbb{K}_l$ of $\mathbb{K}$, the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K})$ on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_F$ reduces to the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(k_{\mathbb{K}_l}/k_{\mathbb{K}})$ on $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_{\mathbb{K}_l})$, and therefore the graph of the map $\mathfrak{r}_F$ over $\mathbb{K}$ is the set of fixed points of the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{K}_l/\mathbb{K}) \times \mathrm{Gal}(k_{\mathbb{K}_l}/k_{\mathbb{K}})$ on the graph of $\mathfrak{r}_F$ in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}_l)_F \times \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_{\mathbb{K}_l})$, and therefore it is definable as discussed above. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \in \mathfrak{P}_\Psi$ be an optimal point. Then the sets $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ and $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r^+}$ are definable.*

Proof. As in the previous lemma, consider the split case first. By definition, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r} = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_r \oplus \sum_{\{\psi\in\tilde{\Phi}|\psi(x)\geq r\}} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi$. Since the set of values $\{\psi(x)\}_{\psi\in\Sigma}$ (where Σ is the set of affine roots from the definition of an optimal point) is field-independent, the indexing set in the sum is a field-independent set determined by the point x; each set $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi$ is definable by definition. The set

$\mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_r$ is clearly definable. Hence, the sum is definable. The same argument applies to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r+}$. The non-split case follows from the split case by passing to the unramified extension, as in the previous lemma. □

Corollary 3.5. *Fix $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the sets $\mathfrak{g}_r$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{r+}$ are definable.*

Proof. Lemma 2.3.2 in [2] states that for every point y in $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist optimal points x, z such that $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r} \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{y,r} \subset \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{z,r}$. Examining the proof of this lemma, we see that in the split case, if y lies in the closure of an alcove C, then x and z also can be found in $\bar{C}$. Then, since the action of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ permutes the alcoves transitively, we have:

$$\mathfrak{g}_r = {}^{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})}\Big(\bigcup_{x \in \mathfrak{P}_\Psi} \mathfrak{g}_{x,r}\Big);$$

$$\mathfrak{g}_{r+} = {}^{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})}\Big(\bigcup_{x \in \bar{C}} \bigcup_{s>r} \mathfrak{g}_{x,s}\Big) = {}^{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})}\Big(\bigcup_{s>r} \bigcup_{x \in \mathfrak{P}_\Psi} \mathfrak{g}_{x,s}\Big) = {}^{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})}\Big(\bigcup_{x \in \mathfrak{P}_\Psi} \mathfrak{g}_{x,r+}\Big).$$

The non-split case is obtained as before by passing to an unramified extension over which $\mathbf{G}$ splits, and taking the fixed points of the Galois action. □

4. Invariant distributions: the classical results

In this section we review the notation and the classical results of the harmonic analysis on p-adic groups.

4.1. **The hypotheses.** Here we collect some of the hypotheses from [16]. There are several technical hypotheses that are required for the parameterisation of nilpotent orbits. These are listed in [16, §2.2], and as DeBacker points out, they hold when the residue characteristic p is larger than a number, which we will denote by M_Ψ, that can be computed from the absolute root datum of $\mathbf{G}$. We shall not list these hypotheses here; we will just assume that the characteristic of the field is larger than M_Ψ.

We will also need to assume that the nilpotent orbital integrals make sense as distributions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. This is so when p is larger than some constant that can be computed from the absolute root datum of $\mathbf{G}$, [16, §3.4] (we also discuss this statement in detail below, in Proposition 5.9). We enlarge M_Ψ if needed, so that this holds when $p > M_\Psi$.

For Theorem 4.6 quoted below, one more hypothesis is needed. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ denote the linear dual of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. In [33, §3.5], Moy and Prasad define a filtration of $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ by lattices $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$, where x is a point in the building $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$, and r is a real number, by

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^*_{x,r} = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^* \mid \lambda(\mathfrak{g}_{x,(-r)^+}) \subset \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}\}.$$

4.1.1. [16, Hypothesis 3.4.1] *There exists a non-degenerate, bilinear, $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-invariant, symmetric form $\langle , \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ such that, under the associated identification of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$, for all $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ and all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ we may identify $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$.*

By [1, Proposition 4.1], this hypothesis holds, except at a small number of primes p that depends only on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$ (see [1] for detail).

We again enlarge M_Ψ if necessary, so that we can assume this hypothesis holds for $p > M_\Psi$.

Examining the proof of [1, Proposition 4.1], we observe that for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $Y \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the value $\langle X, Y\rangle$ is a definable function of the matrix entries of X and Y (recall that we have fixed an embedding of $\mathfrak{g}$ into $\mathfrak{gl}_n$ for some n).

4.2. **The Fourier transform.** Following [16], initially we will avoid identification of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$.

Given a character $\Lambda \in \mathscr{D}_{\mathbb{K}}$, we can define the Fourier transform on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, which maps functions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ to functions on $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$.

Definition 4.1. [16, §3.1] Let dX be the Haar measure on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. For any $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$, let

$$\hat{f}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})} f(X)\Lambda(\lambda(X))\, dX,$$

where $\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$.

The Fourier transform on $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ is defined similarly.

Remark 4.2. As pointed out in [3, §0], there are in fact three objects appearing here: $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, its linear dual $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$, and its Pontryagin dual $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{K})$. The choice of the character Λ is equivalent to the choice of an identification of $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ with $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{K})$.

Later, we will use the bilinear form $\langle, \rangle$ from Hypothesis 4.1.1 to identify $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$. With this identification, the definition of Fourier transform for a function $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$ takes the form:

$$\hat{f}(Y) = \int_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})} f(X)\Lambda(\langle X, Y\rangle)\, dX,$$

and $\hat{f}$ is again a locally constant compactly supported function on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

With the identification of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ given by the form $\langle, \rangle$, for a distribution T on $C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$, its Fourier transform is defined to be

$$\widehat{T}(f) = T(\hat{f}).$$

4.3. **Some spaces of distributions.** Everything in this short section is quoted from [16]. Here we state the key result about the distributions with bounded support, which, in this precise quantitative version and this generality is due to DeBacker. Recall the definitions first.

Definition 4.3. Let $J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$ denote the space of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-invariant distributions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, and $J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$ denote the space of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-invariant distributions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with support in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$. We use the similar notation $J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K}))$, $J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r)$ for the dual Lie algebra. Let $J(\mathcal{N})$ denote the space of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-invariant distributions whose support is contained in the set of nilpotent elements $\mathcal{N}$. Let $\mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})$ denote the set of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. (The set of nilpotent elements, and the nilpotent orbits are discussed in detail in the next section.)

Definition 4.4. Let $\mathcal{D}_r$ be the space of functions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ that can be represented as $f=\sum f_i$, where f_i a complex-valued, compactly supported function on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, invariant under $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{y_i,r}$ for some $y_i\in\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G},\mathbb{K})$.

Remark 4.5. We observe that with our choice of the conductor of the character Λ, if a test function f on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ lies in the space $\mathcal{D}_r$, then the support of its Fourier transform $\hat{f}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{(-r)^+}$, and if the support of f is contained in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$, then $\hat{f}\in\mathcal{D}_{(-r)^+}$.

The following statement is the summary of the part of the main result of [16] that is used in this paper.

Theorem 4.6. [16, Theorem 2.1.5, Corollary 3.4.6 and Remark 2.1.7] *Suppose all the hypotheses mentioned in §4.1 hold. If* $r\in\mathbb{R}$, *then the distributions* $\{\operatorname{res}_{\mathcal{D}_r}\Phi_{\mathcal{O}}\}_{\mathcal{O}\in\mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})}$ *form a basis of* $\operatorname{res}_{\mathcal{D}_r}J(\mathcal{N})$, *and*

$$\operatorname{res}_{\mathcal{D}_r}J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)=\operatorname{res}_{\mathcal{D}_r}J(\mathcal{N}).$$

4.4. **The function η.** In [3, Appendix A], R. Huntsinger proved an integral formula for the function representing the Fourier transform of an invariant distribution, which plays a crucial role in our poof. We need to quote some definitions from [3, Appendix A]. Note that the assumption on the character Λ in [3] is that Λ has conductor $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{K}}$, which agrees with our assumption on Λ.

Definition 4.7. [3, Definition A.1.1] Let K be an open compact subgroup of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$. For $\lambda\in\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ and $X\in\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, define

$$\eta_X(\lambda)=\int_K\Lambda\left(\lambda(\operatorname{Ad}(k)X)\right)\,dk,$$

where dk is the Haar measure on K normalized so that the volume of K is 1.

Definition 4.8. Fix $r\in\mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r}$ denote the characteristic function of the set $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r\subset\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$. Let

$$\eta_{X,r}:=\eta_X\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r}.$$

For every $r\in\mathbb{R}$, the function $\eta_{X,r}$ belongs to the space $C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r)$, see [3, Corollary A.3.4]. Then, given a distribution $\mu\in J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r)$, it makes sense to write $\mu(\eta_X)=\mu(\eta_{X,r})$. Moreover, the map $X\mapsto\eta_{X,r}$ is locally constant in X. The main theorem of [3, Appendix A] is:

Theorem 4.9. [3, Theorem A.1.2] *Fix* $r\in\mathbb{R}$. *Let* $\mu\in J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r)$. *Then* $\widehat{\mu}$ *is represented on* $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ *by the locally constant function* $X\mapsto\mu(\eta_X)$.

Using the bilinear form $\langle,\rangle$ to identify $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$, we can transport the function η to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

Definition 4.10. Let $\tilde{\eta}$ be the function on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ defined by:

$$\tilde{\eta}_X(Y) = \int_K \Lambda(\langle \mathrm{Ad}(k)X, Y\rangle)\, dk,$$

and let

$$\tilde{\eta}_{X,r} := \tilde{\eta}_X \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r}.$$

Now, observe that if we identify $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$ using the form $\langle , \rangle$, then the space of distributions $J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K}))$ is identified with the space $J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$. Since the set $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r$ is identified with $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the space $J(\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})_r)$ is identified with $J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$. Now Theorem 4.9 can be restated as:

Corollary 4.11. *Fix $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mu \in J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$. Then $\widehat{\mu}$ is represented on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ by the locally constant function $X \mapsto \mu(\tilde{\eta}_X)$.*

4.5. **A note on the normalization of Haar measure.** There are several "competing" normalizations of measures that arise as we apply motivic integration techniques to the study of representations arising in harmonic analysis on reductive groups. Every definable set comes with the *canonical* measure (which is a generalization [41] of the Serre-Oesterlé measure, [38, §3], [34]; see also [23, §2] for an exposition in the context of motivic integration). If $X_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a definable set (a specialization of a definable subassignment X to $\mathbb{K}$), then the canonical measure on $X_{\mathbb{K}}$ is the measure that the motivic measure on X specializes to. For example, for a Chevalley group $\mathbf{G}$, the canonical measure on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ is the Haar measure such that the volume of the maximal compact subgroup $\mathbf{G}(\Omega_{\mathbb{K}})$ equals $|\mathbf{G}(k_{\mathbb{K}})|q^{-\dim(\mathbf{G})}$. On the other hand, one of the traditional normalizations of Haar measure in harmonic analysis gives the same subgroup the volume 1.

Additionally, when dealing with Fourier transform on the Lie algebra, a choice of Haar measure on $\mathbf{G}$ together with a choice of the conductor of the additive character Λ used to define Fourier transform determines the normalization of Haar measure on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that the Fourier inversion formula $\hat{\hat{f}}(X) = f(-X)$, holds, with the natural identification of $\mathfrak{g}^{**}$ with $\mathfrak{g}$. On the other hand, we use a bilinear form to identify $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with $\mathfrak{g}^*(\mathbb{K})$, and we want that identification to be measure-preserving. At the same time, because of our use of motivic integration, we have a preferred choice of the conductor of the character Λ. Thus, we use our character, and the bilinear form $\langle , \rangle$ to normalize the measure on $\mathfrak{g}^*$, at the cost of possibly allowing a constant to appear in the Fourier inversion formula (which we do not use).

Our default choice of the measure is the canonical measure, for the purposes of specialization of motivic integrals. This choice contributes to the constant $c_{\mathbb{K}}$ that appears in Proposition 5.9 and Theorem 6.2; however, this constant is not important for our purposes, since it is a global constant that depends on the given field only through its residue field, and cannot affect the questions of integrability or boundedness of functions.

However, we are very careful with all other relationships between the canonical measures and invariant measures: the one case especially relevant here is the nilpotent orbits. In Proposition 5.8 below, we prove that the nilpotent orbits are definable subassignments (with parameters ranging over the residue field). Thus, every nilpotent orbit carries a canonical measure. However, we still need to show that the invariant measure on the orbit is related to the canonical measure via a definable function. This is done by analysis of [36], and constitutes Proposition 5.9.

5. Nilpotent orbital integrals

As above, $\mathbf{G}$ denotes a connected reductive unramified algebraic group. We will use the letter $\mathbb{K}$ to denote a local field in $\mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$. In this section, this is the only assumption we impose on the group; we will also be assuming that the residue characteristic of the field is large enough (specified a bit more precisely below). Hypothesis 4.1.1 is not required here.

5.1. **Nilpotent elements.** For an element of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, there are several definitions of "nilpotent" in the literature:

1. Recall that we think of $\mathfrak{g}$ as a closed subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$ for some m. Call $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ nilpotent if $X^m = 0$ (where X is thought of as an $m \times m$-matrix).
2. $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ is called nilpotent if 0 is contained in the Zariski closure of the adjoint orbit of X.
3. $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ is called nilpotent if 0 is contained in the closure of the adjoint orbit of X in the p-adic topology.
4. $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ is called nilpotent if there exists $\lambda \in X_*^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbf{G})$ such that
$$\lim_{t\to 0} \mathrm{Ad}(\lambda(t))X = 0.$$

We shall see below that for sufficiently large p all these definitions are equivalent. In general, as DeBacker points out in [17], the requirement (4) clearly implies (3), which implies (2); and if $\mathbb{K}$ is perfect (in particular, in the case $\mathbb{K}$ of characteristic zero), (2) is equivalent to (4). Since in all the cases we consider the residue field is finite, by [2, Lemma 2.5.1], the definitions (3) and (4) are equivalent. From now on, we adopt the definition (4) as the definition of nilpotent. Let us denote the set of nilpotent elements by $\mathcal{N}$. Following DeBacker, we denote by $\mathcal{O}(0, \mathbb{K})$ the set of orbits of nilpotent elements. This set is finite when $\mathbb{K}$ has characteristic zero or residue characteristic bigger than the number M_Ψ of §4.1.

Lemma 5.1. *The set $\mathcal{N}$ is definable. More precisely, there exists a definable subassignment, which we will also denote by $\mathcal{N}$, and a constant M that depends only on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$, such that given $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$, the set of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ is the specialization $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. For the moment, fix the field $\mathbb{K}$. For every cocharacter $\lambda \in X_*^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbf{G})$, the set of $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\lim_{t\to 0} \mathrm{Ad}(\lambda(t))X = 0$ is the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_+(\lambda)$

of the subgroup $U(\lambda)$ defined in [40, §13.4.1]. Then by definition,

$$\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in X_*^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbf{G})} \mathfrak{g}_+(\lambda),$$

(note that in fact it is a finite union, since $U(n\lambda) = U(\lambda)$ for $n > 0$, [40, 13.4.7 (2)]). Now we can let the field $\mathbb{K}$ vary. As explained in [14, §5.1], $X_*^{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbf{G})$ can be thought of as a definable subassignment. By [40, Theorem 13.4.2 (ii)], $\mathfrak{g}_+(\lambda)$ is a sum of weight spaces of the action of $\mathbf{G}_m$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ via $\mathrm{Ad} \circ \lambda$, which are, by definition, definable. Hence, $\mathcal{N}$ is a definable subassignment. □

Corollary 5.2. *When p is sufficiently large (depending on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$), all the above definitions of "nilpotent" are equivalent.*

Proof. It is clear that the set of elements of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ satisfying definition (1) is a specialization of a definable subassignment, when the characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is sufficiently large. By Lemma 5.1, the set of elements satisfying definition (4) is a specialization of a definable subassignment as well. On the other hand, in characteristic zero these sets coincide; hence they coincide when characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is sufficiently large. □

Remark 5.3. We note some more relations between the above definitions, independently of the characteristic of the field. It follows from [40, Corollary 15.1.5, Theorem 13.4.2 (i), and Proposition 14.1.4] that condition (4) implies (1). Conversely, if $\mathbf{G}$ is split, by [39, Lemma 2.2], (1) implies (4). Hence, for split groups $\mathbf{G}$, all the definitions are equivalent, without restriction on the characteristic.

In this paper we quote some results from [20], where definition (1) is used. In [20] only split groups are considered, so there is no harm in replacing definition (1) used there with (4). (Alternatively, we can assume that the characteristic of the field is large enough so that all the definitions are equivalent.)

5.2. **Parameterisation of nilpotent orbits.** Ultimately, one would like to have a definable subassignment in RDef that specializes to $\mathcal{O}(0, \mathbb{K})$ when the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ is large enough. In her thesis [20], [21], J. Diwadkar constructed such a subassignment (and in fact, showed that the orbits themselves are definable sets), for (split) special orthogonal groups and for the exceptional group G_2. Here we will use her methods to prove a slightly weaker result in general, which is sufficient for our purposes.

We construct a definable subassignment $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{RDef}$, and a definable subassignment $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}} \in \mathrm{Def}_{\mathcal{E}}$ such that for every $x \in \mathcal{E}$, the fibre of $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ over x is a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$, and all nilpotent orbits appear at least once (see Proposition 5.8 below for a detailed statement). What makes $\mathcal{E}$ different from a parameter space for nilpotent orbits is that each orbit may (and generally does) appear more than once as a fibre of $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$. The repetition of orbits also accounts for the discrepancy between $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. Following the approach of [20, Chapter 7], we use the parameterisation of nilpotent orbits via Bruhat-Tits theory.

Remark 5.4. For split classical groups, and for the unitary groups, it is possible to use Waldspurger's parameterisation of nilpotent orbits, [42, §I.6] instead. This approach is worked out in [21] in the case of special orthogonal groups.

We start by quoting the theorem which in characteristic zero is due to Barbasch and Moy, and in general is a special case of a much more refined result of DeBacker. Let $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega \cup \mathcal{B}_\Omega$.

Definition 5.5. An element of a Lie algebra over $k_\mathbb{K}$ is called distinguished if it is nilpotent and does not lie in any proper Levi subalgebra.

Let I^d be the set consisting of pairs $(F, \bar{\mathcal{O}})$ where $F \subset \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ is a facet, and $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is a distinguished $\mathbf{G}_F(k_\mathbb{K})$-orbit in $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_\mathbb{K})$.

Theorem 5.6. *(Barbasch and Moy* [7]*, DeBacker* [17]*). If $F \subset \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ is a facet and $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is a distinguished nilpotent orbit in $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_\mathbb{K}) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F/\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F^+$, then there exists a unique nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ of minimal dimension which intersects the pre-image of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_F$ non-trivially, and each nilpotent orbit appears this way.*

Remark 5.7. In fact, a much more refined statement is proved in [17] – namely, DeBacker defines an equivalence relation $\sim$ on I^d that allows to get a bijection between the set of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ and the set $I^d/{\sim}$; however, it is not generally possible to take quotient spaces (even when the equivalence relation itself is definable) within Denef-Pas language. Because of this, we will ignore the equivalence, and just construct an orbit for each element of I^d, and this is why we have quoted only part of the statement from [17].

5.2.1. *Distinguished orbits.* Let $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$ be the finite set associated with the root datum (Ψ, θ), whose elements are all the facets of an alcove in the split case, and of Galois-fixed points of an alcove in the non-split case, equipped with incidence relations and $\widetilde{W}$-action, as in §3.2. It will be convenient to talk about "definable subassignments over $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$". By such a subassignment we will mean a disjoint union of definable subassignments indexed by the elements of $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$.

Let $F \in \bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$ be a facet. By Lemma 3.3, the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ is a specialization of a definable subassignment in RDef. Each Levi subalgebra is again an unramified reductive Lie algebra over the residue field, hence, it is in RDef by the construction of §3.1. Moreover, the list of Levi subalgebras, up to conjugation, is field-independent in the same sense as above: it can be pre-computed from the root datum. Hence the complement of the union of all Levi subalgebras of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F$ is definable. Clearly, being nilpotent (over the residue field) is a definable condition. We denote by $\mathcal{E}_F$ the set of nilpotent elements in this complement. We define the subassignment $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Def}$ as the disjoint union over facets:

$$\mathcal{E} := \coprod_{F \in \bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}} \mathcal{E}_F.$$

We will think of the points of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$ as pairs $(F, \bar{x})$, where F is a facet (*i.e.*, an element of the set $\bar{C}_{(\Psi,\theta)}$), and $\bar{x}$ is an element of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_F(k_{\mathbb{K}})$.

5.2.2. *Correspondence between distinguished elements and nilpotent orbits.* We are now ready to interpret the nilpotent orbits as the fibres of a definable subassignment over $\mathcal{E}$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let* $\mathbf{G}$ *be an unramified connected reductive group with a Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}$ *as above. There exists a definable subassignment* $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}} \subset \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{N}$ *in* $\mathrm{Def}_{\mathcal{E}}$*, with the property that for every local field* $\mathbb{K}$ *of sufficiently large residue characteristic, for every* $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$*, the fibre* $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}_{x,\mathbb{K}}$ *is a single orbit, and each nilpotent orbit appears among the fibres of* $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}_{\mathbb{K}}$*.*

Proof. The proof follows [20]. Define $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}} \subset \mathfrak{g} \times \mathcal{E}$ by $(X, x) \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ if and only if all of the following conditions hold:

1. $X \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x = (F, \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$;
2. the orbit of X intersects the preimage $\mathfrak{r}_F^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ of the orbit $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ of $\bar{x}$ non-trivially;
3. the orbit of X has the minimal possible dimension among those satisfying the previous condition.

By Theorem 5.6, if X is nilpotent and $(X, x) \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$, then the fibre of $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ over x is a single nilpotent orbit, and all such orbits appear among the fibres (note that due to the fact that we do not identify the points $\bar{x}$ that lie in the same orbit over the residue field, and ignore the equivalence relation of [17] between the pairs of facets and distinguished orbits, almost every nilpotent orbit appears among the fibres of $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ several times).

Thus, it only remains to explain why conditions (1) – (3) are definable, *i.e.*, can be expressed by formulas in Denef-Pas language. It is trivial for condition (1); for conditions (2) and (3) we follow [20]. It is proved in [20, §6.2.1] that condition (3) is definable. Indeed, we have:

$$\dim \mathcal{O}(X) = \dim \mathfrak{g} - \dim \mathfrak{g}^X,$$

where $\mathfrak{g}^X$ is the centralizer of X; as observed in [20], the centralizer $\mathfrak{g}^X$ is a vector space, and the dimension of a vector space can be expressed by a Denef-Pas formula.

Condition (2) is expressed by the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(X, x) = \text{`}\exists (Y \in \mathfrak{g}_F); \quad &\exists (g \in \mathbf{G}) \text{ such that} \\ &(gYg^{-1} = X) \text{ and } (\mathfrak{r}_F(Y) = \bar{x}),\text{'}\end{aligned}$$

where all the ingredients such as $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathbf{G}$, and $\mathfrak{r}_F$ are understood as definable subassignments (respectively, morphisms of definable subassignments), see Lemma 3.3.

□

5.3. **Nilpotent orbital integrals as distributions.** We will denote the nilpotent orbital integral as a distribution by $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}}$, and the locally constant function representing its Fourier transform will be denoted by $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$. Here, as above, $\mathcal{E}$ denotes the definable subassignment of §5.2.1 that specializes to the set of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

The next proposition is the main technical point of this paper. It states that every nilpotent orbital integral $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a "motivic distribution", in the sense that it takes any constructible family of definable test functions to a motivic function in the parameters indexing the family.

Proposition 5.9. *Given a constructible family of motivic exponential test functions $\{f_a\}_{a\in S}$, such that $f_{a,\mathbb{K}} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}))$, where $S \in Def$ is some definable subassignment, there exists a motivic exponential function F on $\mathcal{E}\times S$, and a constant $M > 0$, such that for every field $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$, and for every point $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$, we have*

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{O}(x)}(f_{a,\mathbb{K}}) = c_{\mathbb{K}} F_{\mathbb{K}}(x,a) \quad \textit{for all } a \in S_{\mathbb{K}},$$

where $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is the nilpotent orbit corresponding to the point x, and $c_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a normalization constant that depends only on the field, and is a ratio of integrals of definable functions over definable subassignments. (Note that naturally, both F and M depend on the family $\{f_a\}_{a\in S}$).

Proof. The proof follows the foundational paper by Ranga Rao, [36]; we just check that all the ingredients appearing in Ranga Rao's formula for the orbital integral are definable. Note that Ranga Rao makes the assumption that the field has characteristic zero. As DeBacker points out in [16, §3.4], "an analysis of [36] shows that if p is larger than some constant which can be determined from the absolute root datum of $\mathbf{G}$, then nilpotent orbital integrals converge as distributions on $\mathfrak{g}$". We will show below that all the objects that appear in Ranga Rao's proof of the explicit formula for the nilpotent orbital integrals are definable. One can also see that all the constructions appearing in his proofs are definable in Denef-Pas language (we omit that analysis). This implies, in particular, that indeed all the conclusions of [36] hold in sufficiently large positive characteristic.

For a point $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$, denote the fibre of the definable subassignment $\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{mot}}$ over x by $\mathcal{O}(x)$. By Proposition 5.8, $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. Let $\Phi_x = \Phi_{\mathcal{O}(x)}$, so that Φ_x is, as we shall now prove, a distribution on $C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$.

Let $X_0 \in \mathcal{O}(x)$. Then X_0 is nilpotent. Let $H_0, Y_0 \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ be elements forming an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple with X_0. Their existence is guaranteed by Jacobson-Morozov theorem; H_0 is unique up to conjugation by the centralizer of X_0, and Y_0 is uniquely determined by the choice of H_0. We will let H_0, along with X_0, be a parameter in all the subsequent formulas. Since the final answer does not depend on the choice of H_0, at the end we will be able to eliminate it. For now, we observe that H_0 ranges over a definable set (with X_0 as a parameter), (the set of the possible H_0 is defined, for example, by the conjunction of $[H_0, X_0] = 2X_0$, and $\exists Y_0 : [H_0, Y_0] = -2Y_0, [X_0, Y_0] = H_0$). For each integer μ, let

$$\mathfrak{g}_\mu = \{X : X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}), [H_0, X] = \mu X\}.$$

By definition, all the sets $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ are definable, and only finitely many of them are non-zero (indexed by integers from the interval which we will denote $[-r_\Psi, r_\Psi]$, with the number r_Ψ depending only on the root datum of $\mathfrak{g}$). Let

$$\mathfrak{n}_\lambda = \oplus_{\lambda > \mu} \mathfrak{g}_\mu.$$

This set is also definable, defined by the formula

$$\phi_{\mathfrak{n}}(X) = \text{`}\exists (Y_\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu) \text{ such that } (X = \sum_\mu Y_\mu)\text{'},$$

where μ ranges through the list of integers from $-r_\Psi$ to λ. Let M_0 be the centralizer of H_0 in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ (note that it is definable). Let

$$V_0 = \{\mathrm{Ad}(m)X_0 \mid m \in M_0\}.$$

By definition this is a definable set; as Ranga Rao points out, it is an open subset of $\mathfrak{g}_2$.

Pick the bases $Z_1, \dots, Z_r$ and $Z'_1, \dots, Z'_r$ for $\mathfrak{g}_1$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{-1}$, respectively, that are dual with respect to the Killing form. Note that the condition that a collection of vectors forms a basis of a given vector space is definable, as explained in [20, §3.5.2] (or in [22]). (We observe that the Killing form is a non-degenerate bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}_1 \times \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ in characteristic zero or when the characteristic of the field is positive and sufficiently large, since the Killing form is a definable function of its arguments). Let $[X, Z'_i] = \sum_j c_{ij}(X) Z_i$, and let

$$\varphi(X) = |\det(c_{ij}(X))|^{1/2}.$$

Note that $\varphi(X)$ is a specialization of the motivic function

$$\varphi_{\mathrm{mot}}(X) := \mathbb{L}^{-\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{ord}(\det(c_{ij}(X)))};$$

here $\mathbb{L}$ is the formal symbol (see [13, §4.2]) that specializes to the cardinality of the residue field when we pass to the specialization of the motivic function in the given field $\mathbb{K}$.

Let $\mathfrak{p}_0 = \oplus_{\mu \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}_\mu$, and let $\mathbf{P}_0$ be the corresponding parabolic subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. There exists a compact open subgroup K of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ such that $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}) = K\mathbf{P}_0$. Note that K can be chosen to be a maximal compact subgroup; then up to conjugacy, K is a parahoric subgroup corresponding to a vertex in an alcove, and all such subgroups are definable by the same argument as in Lemma 3.3. Note that since K is open in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, the Haar measure on K is a constant multiple of the Haar measure on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$; the constant that arises is by definition the ratio of the canonical volumes of two definable subassignments. For a function $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}))$, define

$$\bar{f}(Y) := \int_K f(\mathrm{Ad}(u)Y)\, du.$$

Since all the ingredients in the above integral are definable, by the main theorem of [12], given a constructible family of motivic exponential functions $\{f_a\}_{a\in S}$, the resulting family $\{\bar{f}_a(Y)\}$ is also a constructible family of motivic exponential functions.

Let G_0 be the centralizer of X_0 in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ (by definition, this is a definable set depending on the parameter X_0). By [36, Theorem 1], the orbital integral at X_0 can be expressed as:

$$\Phi_x(f_a) = \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/G_0} f_a(\mathrm{Ad}\, gX_0)\, dg^* = c\int_{V_0\oplus\mathfrak{n}_2} \varphi(X)\bar{f}_a(X+Z)\, dX dZ, \tag{2}$$

where $X \in V_0$, $Z \in \mathfrak{n}_2$, dX and dZ denote Haar measures on the vector spaces $\mathfrak{g}_2$ and $\mathfrak{n}_2$ respectively, and c is a constant.

We have shown above that all the ingredients appearing in the integral on the right-hand side of (2) are definable, using X_0, H_0 as parameters. However, the resulting orbital integral depends only on the conjugacy class of X_0. By the main theorem of [12], given a constructible family of motivic exponential functions $\{f_b\}_{b\in S}$, the result of the integration is a motivic exponential function of b and the parameters X_0, H_0; since the result does not depend on the choice of H_0, we can average over all these choices without changing the result. Thus, we get the motivic function of b and x, since x determines the conjugacy class of X_0.

It remains to investigate how the constant c appearing in (2) depends on the field $\mathbb{K}$. The claim that c is a ratio of integrals of definable functions over definable subassignments follows from [36, Equations (5) and (6)] by inspection, if we plug in for f the characteristic function of a definable compact set. □

6. DEFINABILITY AND LOCAL INTEGRABILITY

6.1. **Fourier transforms of nilpotent orbital integrals.** In this section, we state all the results for orbital integrals assuming Hypothesis 4.1.1, since it allows us to state them in the form that will be used below to prove the analogous statements about Harish-Chandra characters. However, if we did not assume this hypothesis, we would obtain similar results, with the only difference that all Fourier transforms would be distributions on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and not on $\mathfrak{g}$. Recall the function $\tilde{\eta}_X$ from 4.4.

Lemma 6.1. *The functions $Y \mapsto \tilde{\eta}_X(Y)$ form a constructible family of motivic exponential functions (indexed by $X \in \mathfrak{g}$). More precisely, there exists a motivic exponential function Υ on $\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{g}$, and a constant M_Υ such that for all $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M_\Upsilon} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M_\Upsilon}$, we have*

$$\Upsilon_{\mathbb{K}}(X,Y) = \tilde{\eta}_X(Y),$$

for all $(X, Y) \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}) \times \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof. In the definition of the function $\tilde{\eta}_X$, the compact open subgroup K is arbitrary. Let us pick a definable open compact subgroup. Then the statement follows immediately from the main theorem about motivic integrals of motivic exponential functions, [12, Theorem 4.1.1], which states that if we integrate a motivic exponential function with respect to some of its variables, the result is a motivic exponential function of the remaining variables. □

Theorem 6.2. *Let* $\mathcal{O}$ *be a nilpotent orbit in* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. *Then the Fourier transform of the corresponding orbital integral is, up to a constant multiple, the specialization of a motivic exponential function. More precisely, there exists a positive integer* M_0*, and a motivic exponential function* F *on* $\mathcal{E} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$*, such that for every* $y \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$*, we have*

$$\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}(y)}(X) = c_{\mathbb{K}} F_{\mathbb{K}}(y, X)$$

for all $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M_0} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M_0}$*,* $X \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathbb{K})$*, where* $c_{\mathbb{K}}$ *is the constant from Proposition 5.9.*

Proof. Let $y \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$, and let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(y)$. The main ingredient in the proof is Huntsinger's formula for the orbital integrals, so we need to fix $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Pick an arbitrary $r > 0$. By Lemma 6.1 and Corollary 3.5, the functions $Y \mapsto \tilde{\eta}_{X,r}(Y)$ form a constructible family of motivic exponential functions (indexed by $X \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$). Then by Proposition 5.9, there exists a constant (denote it by M_η), and a motivic exponential function F^η on $\mathcal{E} \times \mathfrak{g}$ such that for all $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M_\eta} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M_\eta}$ we have:

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{\eta}_X) = c_{\mathbb{K}} F^\eta_{\mathbb{K}}(y, X).$$

(In order to think of the functions $\tilde{\eta}_X$ appearing on the left-hand side as specializations of a family of motivic functions, we need to assume that the constant M_η is not smaller than the constant M_Υ of Lemma 6.1.) Now let $M_0 = \max(M_\Psi, M_\eta)$, and let $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M_0} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M_0}$. By Huntsinger's formula (see Corollary 4.11), we have the equality

$$\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X) = \Phi_{\mathcal{O}}(\tilde{\eta}_X),$$

and thus $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X) = c_{\mathbb{K}} F^\eta_{\mathbb{K}}(y, X)$, since both are locally constant functions on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ extended by zero to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, and the proof is completed. □

Remark 6.3. Strictly speaking, we have done slightly more work than necessary in order to prove the above theorem. Namely, we did not have to find an object in RDef whose residue-field points correspond to the nilpotent orbits. Alternatively, we could have used the observation that the orbit of X is a definable set with X as a parameter, and obtained a motivic function $F(X, Y)$ on $\mathcal{N} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ such that $F_{\mathbb{K}}(X, Y) = \widehat{\mu}_X(Y)$. However, we feel that it is important in the context of this paper to emphasize that the set of nilpotent orbits depends on $\mathbb{K}$ only via its residue field, hence we included the present construction.

Corollary 6.4. *There exists a constant* $M_{\mathbf{G}} > 0$ *that depends only on the root datum of* $\mathbf{G}$*, such that for every* $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$*, and every nilpotent orbit* $\mathcal{O}$ *in* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$*, the function* $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$ *is locally integrable on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$*, and the function* $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$ *is locally bounded on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$*.*

Proof. Let $y \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{K}}$, such that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(y)$. First, let M_0 and F^{η} be as in Theorem 6.2, so that for every $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega, M_0} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_0}$ we have:

$$\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X) = c_{\mathbb{K}} F^{\eta}_{\mathbb{K}}(y, X),$$

for $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$. We extend both functions by zero outside $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$. Note that the function F^{η} has a choice of representatives that comes from the proof of Theorem 6.2 (this includes representatives we have for the family $\tilde{\eta}_X$ and all the formulas used in the proof of Proposition 5.9). Let $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ be the constant that appears in Theorem 2.2 for this choice of representatives. We can assume that $M_{\mathbf{G}} \geq M_0$. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be an arbitrary field of positive characteristic in $\mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$, and let $k_{\mathbb{K}}$ be its residue field. Let $\mathbb{K}'$ be a characteristic zero field in $\mathcal{A}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$ with the residue field isomorphic to $k_{\mathbb{K}}$. By Harish-Chandra's theorem [27, Theorem 4.4], on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}')$, the function $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is integrable on any compact set. Thus, for any definable compact set, the restriction of $F^{\eta}_{\mathbb{K}'}(y, X)$ is integrable. Then by the Transfer of integrability principle (Theorem 2.2), the restriction to any definable compact set of the function $F^{\eta}_{\mathbb{K}}(y, X)$ is integrable, and thus $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is locally integrable on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. Observe that the function $D_G(X)$ is definable, since, by definition, it is a coefficient in the characteristic polynomial $\det(t - \mathrm{ad}(X))$. Then the function $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is, up to a constant, a specialization of the motivic exponential function $F^{\eta}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{O}, X)\mathbb{L}^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{ord}(D_G(X))}$, and the last statement follows from Theorem 2.3. □

Remark 6.5. Since the constant $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ defined in the above corollary appears as the restriction on the characteristic in all our subsequent theorems, here we summarise its origins:

1. $M_{\mathbf{G}} \geq M_{\Psi}$ (where M_{Ψ} is the constant defined in §3.1, see also §4.1), so that the group $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ indeed has the root datum (Ψ, θ), (or more precisely, so that we get the group from the finite family of groups defined by replacing θ with θ' such that θ and θ' generate the same group of automorphisms of Ψ), and the hypotheses of [16, §2.2] hold.
2. $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ has to be large enough so that the motivic parameterisation of nilpotent orbits (Proposition 5.8) works.
3. $M_{\mathbf{G}} \geq M_{\Upsilon}$, where M_{Υ} is the constant defined in Lemma 6.1, so that the family of motivic functions of Lemma 6.1 specializes to the Huntsinger's functions $\tilde{\eta}_X$. In particular, it is large enough so that the bilinear form $\langle , \rangle$ of §4.1.1 exists.
4. $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ needs to be large enough so that for the family of functions $\tilde{\eta}_X$, the motivic integrals over the orbits specialize to the orbital integrals, see Proposition 5.9.

(5) Finally, $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ might need to be enlarged further so that transfer of integrability holds for the motivic exponential functions that specialize to $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$'s.

6.2. **Harish-Chandra characters near the identity.** The local character expansion in large positive characteristic is proved by DeBacker [16] near the identity, and by Adler-Korman [4] near a general tame semisimple element. These results require an additional hypothethis on the existence of the so-called mock exponential map. We start by quoting the hypothesis and the local character expansion.

6.2.1. *The exponential map hypothesis.* [16, Hypothesis 3.2.1]. *Suppose* $r > 0$. *There exists a bijective map* $\mathbf{e} : \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r \to \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r$ *such that*

1. *for all pairs* $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$, $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq r}$, *we have*
   - (a) $\mathbf{e}(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s}) = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s}$,
   - (b) *For all* $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,r}$ *and for all* $Y \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s}$, *we have* $\mathbf{e}(X)\mathbf{e}(Y) \equiv \mathbf{e}(X+Y) \mod \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s^+}$, *and*
   - (c) $\mathbf{e}$ *induces a group isomorphism* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s}/\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{s,s^+}$ *with* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{x,s}/\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_{s,s^+}$*;*
2. *for all* $g \in \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ *we have* $\mathrm{Int}(g) \circ \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e} \circ \mathrm{Ad}(g)$*;*
3. $\mathbf{e}$ *carries* dX *into* dg.

For split classical groups one can take $\mathbf{e}$ to be the Cayley transform, for all $r > 0$.

Recall the notation: the definable subassignment $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ specializes to the set of regular semisimple elements in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, for $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M}$ with some constant M that depends only on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$.

Remark 6.6. [16, Remark 3.2.2] A map satisfying this hypothesis will automatically map $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ to $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r \cap \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

For an admissible representation π of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, we denote its *depth* (defined in [33, Theorem 5.2]) by $\rho(\pi)$.

Theorem 6.7. *(*[16, Theorem 3.5.2]*) Let* $\mathbb{K}$ *be a complete non-Archimedean local field with finite residue field of characteristic* p. *Let* π *be an admissible representation of* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$. *Choose* r *such that* $\mathfrak{g}_r = \mathfrak{g}_{\rho(\pi)^+}$. *Suppose* p *is sufficiently large so that the hypotheses from §4.1 are satisfied. Suppose also that Hypothesis 6.2.1 holds. Then there exist constants* $c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi) \in \mathbb{C}$ *indexed by* $\mathcal{O}(0, \mathbb{K})$ *such that*

$$\theta_\pi(\mathbf{e}(X)) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi) \widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X)$$

for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$.

We observe that the coefficients $c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi)$ are defined only after the field $\mathbb{K}$ is fixed; at present we do not have any general approach that would yield any information about the way they depend on the field, since such an approach to begin with would require a field-independent way to parameterise representations. For toral very supercuspidal representations the beginnings of such a parameterisation are discussed in [10].

Combining the local character expansion with our Corollary 6.4, we obtain local integrability of Harish-Chandra character near the identity.

Let $D_G(g)$ be the discriminant defined by Harish-Chandra in [25] – it is the coefficient at t^r (where r is the rank of $\mathbf{G}$) in the polynomial $\det\left((t+1)I - \mathrm{Ad}(g)\right)$.

Theorem 6.8. *Let* $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$ *be a complete non-Archimedean local field of equal characteristic* $p > M_{\mathbf{G}}$*, where* $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ *is the constant from Corollary 6.4 (cf. Remark 6.5). Suppose also that Hypothesis 6.2.1 holds. Let* π *be an admissible representation of* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$*. Choose* r *such that* $\mathfrak{g}_r = \mathfrak{g}_{\rho(\pi)^+}$*. Then*

(1) *The function* θ_π *extended by zero to* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}) \setminus \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ *is locally integrable on* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r$*.*

(2) *For every* $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r)$*, the integral*

$$\int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})} \theta_\pi(g) f(g)\, dg$$

converges, and equals $\Theta_\pi(f)$*.*

(3) *The function* $|D_G(g)|^{1/2}\theta_\pi(g)$ *is locally bounded on* $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r$*.*

Proof. Parts (1) and (3) are immediate: by Theorem 6.7, on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r$ the function θ_π is a linear combination of the functions $\widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$, and these functions are locally integrable and locally bounded, when normalized by the factor $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}$, by Corollary 6.4.

To prove Part (2), first observe that even though the local character expansion is stated in [16] as an equality of functions defined on the regular set, in fact it is proved at the level of distributions, without the assumption that the support of the test function is contained in the regular set; see the proof of [16, Theorem 3.5.2], where (using our notation for the orbital integral) it is shown that for any $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$,

$$\Theta_\pi(f \circ \mathbf{e}^{-1}) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi) \widehat{\Phi}_{\mathcal{O}}(f).$$

The convergence of the integral in (2) follows from Part (1). Finally, we have, for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})_r)$:

$$\Theta_\pi(f) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi) \widehat{\Phi}_{\mathcal{O}}(f \circ \mathbf{e}) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}}(\pi) \int_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})} (f \circ \mathbf{e})(X) \widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}(X)\, dX$$

$$= \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})} \theta_\pi(g) f(g)\, dg.$$

□

6.3. **Regular semisimple orbital integrals and Shalika germs.** Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a local field with residue characteristic large enough so that the subassignment $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ specializes to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ in $\mathbb{K}$. Let $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$ be a regular semisimple element. Then the adjoint orbit of X is definable, using X as a parameter: it is defined by the formula $\phi(Y) =$ ‘$(\exists g)\,\mathrm{Ad}(g)X = Y$’; thus, there exists a definable subassignment in the category $\mathrm{Def}_{\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}}$ such that its fibre over every point $X \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathbb{K})$ is the orbit of X.

Let Φ_X be the orbital integral at X,

$$\Phi_X(f) = \int_{\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})/C_G(X)} f(\mathrm{Ad}\, gX)\, d^*g,$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K}))$.

It is explained in [14, §7.2] that the invariant measure on the orbit d^*g used in the definition of the orbital integral coincides with the canonical (“motivic”) measure on it. We observe that even though it is the *stable* orbit of X that is discussed in [14, §7.2], it does not change the argument: the stable orbit of X is a finite disjoint union of orbits; the measure on the orbit of X can be thought of as the restriction of the measure on the stable orbit. Hence, by the main theorems on motivic integration, the analogue of Proposition 5.9 holds for regular semisimple orbital integrals as well:

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\{f_a\}_{a\in S}$ be a constructible family of motivic (respectively, motivic exponential) functions, where S is some definable subassignment. Then there exists a constant M' that depends only on the root datum of $\mathbf{G}$ and the formulas defining the family $\{f_a\}_{a\in S}$, and a motivic (respectively, motivic exponential) function H^f on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}} \times S$, such that for every field $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M'} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M'}$, we have for every $X \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{\mathbb{K}}$:*

$$\Phi_X(f_a) = H^f_{\mathbb{K}}(X, a).$$

As before, we denote by $\widehat{\mu}_X$ the function (defined and locally constant on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$, extended by zero to $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$), representing the Fourier transform of the orbital integral.

In order to prove the next theorem about local integrability of the functions $\widehat{\mu}_X$ in positive characteristic, we need an extension of Lemma 6.1 to the family of functions $\tilde{\eta}_{X,l}$ which is “uniform in l”, as l runs through the integers.

Lemma 6.10. *The functions $Y \mapsto \tilde{\eta}_{X,l}(Y)$ form a constructible family of motivic exponential functions (indexed by $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$). More precisely, there exists a motivic exponential function Υ^u on $\mathfrak{g} \times h[0,0,1] \times \mathfrak{g}$, and a constant M^u_Υ such that for all $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega,M^u_\Upsilon} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega,M^u_\Upsilon}$, we have*

$$\Upsilon^u_{\mathbb{K}}(X, l, Y) = \tilde{\eta}_{X,l}(Y),$$

for all $(X, l, Y) \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof. By definition, $\tilde{\eta}_{X,l} = \tilde{\eta}_X \mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_l}$. By Lemma 6.1, the family $\{\tilde{\eta}_X\}_{X\in\mathfrak{g}}$ is a constructible family of motivic exponential functions, so the only thing we need to show is that the family $\{\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_l}\}_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is constructible in l. Since the set of optimal points is independent of l, we only need to show that for an arbitrary optimal point $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$, the set $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,l}$ depends on l in a definable way. Recall that by definition,

$$\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{x,l} = \mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_l \oplus \sum_{\{\psi \in \tilde{\Phi} \mid \psi(x) \geq l\}} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_\psi .$$

We see directly from the definitions that both the set $\mathfrak{t}(\mathbb{K})_l$, and the indexing set $\{\psi \in \tilde{\Phi} \mid \psi(x) \geq l\}$ are defined by inequalities with l on one side, and a definable function on the other, and thus, depend on l in a definable way. □

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 6.11. (1) *There exists a constant depending only on the root datum of* $\mathbf{G}$*, which we will denote by* $M_{\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{rss}}$*, and a motivic exponential function* H *on* $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}} \times \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ *such that for every local field* $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{rss}}} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{rss}}}$*, for every* $X \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$*, we have*

$$\widehat{\mu}_X(Y) = H_{\mathbb{K}}(X, Y)$$

for all $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$*.*

(2) *For* $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{rss}}}$*, for every* $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$*, the function* $\widehat{\mu}_X$ *is locally integrable on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$*, and the function* $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\widehat{\mu}_X$ *is locally bounded on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$*.*

Proof. We recall that $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K}) = \bigcup_{r<0} \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$. Recall also the notion of *depth* for regular semisimple elements: $d(X)$ is the supremum over $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{K})$ of the numbers $d_x(X)$, where by definition, $d_x(X) = t$ if $X \in \mathfrak{g}_{x,t} \setminus \mathfrak{g}_{x,t^+}$ (with the convention $d_x(0) = \infty$).

The proof of part (1) is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 6.2, with the only difference: there is a number r which is part of the definition of the family $\tilde{\eta}_{X,r}$, and for the nilpotent elements we could just fix an arbitrary r; here we need to be more careful to make sure that there exists a constant $M_{\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{rss}}$ controlling the restriction on the residue characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ that does not depend on the depth of X.

For the moment, fix a field $\mathbb{K}$; let $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$, and let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary real number such that $X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$ (i.e., $r \leq d(X)$). Then the distribution Φ_X lies in the space $J(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$, and by Huntsinger's formula, we have $\widehat{\mu}_X(Y) = \Phi_X(\tilde{\eta}_{Y,r})$, where $\tilde{\eta}_{Y,r}$ are the functions from §4.4. Note that the right-hand side does not depend on r as long as $r \leq d(X)$. Thus, for every integer l, we have

$$\widehat{\mu}_X(Y) = \Phi_X(\tilde{\eta}_{Y,l}) \text{ for } X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_l,\ Y \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}.$$

By Lemma 6.10, for $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega, M_\Upsilon^u} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_\Upsilon^u}$, we have that $\tilde{\eta}_{Y,l}$ is the specialization to $\mathbb{K}$ of the motivic exponential function Υ^u. Take the family $\tilde{\eta}_{Y,l}$ (indexed by $Y \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$) as the family of test functions. Part (1) now follows by applying Lemma 6.9 to this family.

Part (2) follows from Part (1) and Harish-Chandra's theorems [27], by the Transfer of integrability and Transfer of boundedness principles, quoted here as Theorems 2.2 and 2.3.

□

Remark 6.12. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4 of [5], one can conclude from Proposition 5.9 and the results of Cluckers, Hales and Loeser [14] quoted above that Shalika germs are motivic functions. In a different context of motivic integration in $\mathbb{C}(\!(t)\!)$, this result for the sub-regular germ was proved by E. Lawes [29].

6.4. **General invariant distributions near the origin.** Combining our Corollary 6.4 with DeBacker's results summarised above in Theorem 4.6, we obtain a partial extension to the large positive characteristic case (in a neighbourhood of the origin) of Harish-Chandra's theorem about invariant distributions with support bounded modulo conjugation.

Theorem 6.13. *Let* $\mathbf{G}$ *be a connected unramified reductive group with the Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}$*. Let* $M_{\mathbf{G}}$ *be the constant from Corollary 6.4. Let* $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$*, and let* T *be an invariant distribution on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ *with support bounded modulo conjugation. Suppose that the support of* T *is contained in* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{(-r)^+}$ *with some* $r \in \mathbb{R}$*. Then* $\hat{T}$ *is represented by a locally constant function* ϑ_T *on the set* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r \cap \mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})^{\mathrm{reg}}$*, which, extended to* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$*, is locally integrable, and the function* $|D_G(X)|^{1/2}\vartheta_T$ *is locally bounded on* $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$*.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega, M_{\mathbf{G}}}$, and let T be an invariant distribution on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$ with support bounded modulo conjugation. Then the support of T is contained in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_{(-r)^+}$ for sufficiently large r. Fix such an r, and let f be an arbitrary test function with support contained in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$. Then by Remark 4.5, the function $\hat{f}$ belongs to the space $\mathcal{D}_{(-r)^+}$. By Theorem 4.6, the restriction of T to the space $\mathcal{D}_{(-r)^+}$ is a linear combination of the nilpotent orbital integrals. Since by definition, $\widehat{T}(f) = T(\hat{f})$, this implies that for all functions $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r)$,

$$\widehat{T}(f) = T(\hat{f}) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}} \Phi_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{f}) = \sum_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}(0,\mathbb{K})} c_{\mathcal{O}} \widehat{\Phi}_{\mathcal{O}}(f),$$

and therefore on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})_r$, the distribution $\widehat{T}$ is represented by the function $\vartheta_T = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} c_{\mathcal{O}} \widehat{\mu}_{\mathcal{O}}$, which has all the required properties by Corollary 6.4. □

Remark 6.14. We have proved in §6.3 that Fourier transforms of regular semisimple orbital integrals are represented by locally integrable functions on all of $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbb{K})$. The only step missing in the proof of an analogous result for general invariant distributions with support bounded modulo conjugation is the positive-characteristic case of [27, Lemma 4.9] stating that orbital integrals of regular semisimple elements are dense in the space of invariant distributions. We hope to discuss this elsewhere. Instead, for now we rely on DeBacker's theorem (quoted above as Theorem 4.6), which only yields the statement about a neighbourhood of the origin determined by the support of the distribution.

6.5. **Harish-Chandra character on the whole group.** We have established the local integrability of Harish-Chandra character on (the set of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$-conjugates of) a neighbourhood of the identity element in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$, for a field $\mathbb{K}$ of large equal characteristic. Our main tool was the local character expansion, and local integrability of orbital integrals. To prove the local integrability of the character on the whole group $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ one could use the local character expansion near a tame semisimple element established in [4]. There is only one obstacle, which is the reason this result is not included in the present paper: let γ be a semisimple element in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$; we can assume that p is large enough so that γ is tame. In [4], the local character expansion in a neighbourhood of γ is given in terms of the nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{m}$ – the Lie algebra of the centralizer of γ. We can apply the results of the present paper to transfer the statement about local integrability of these orbital integrals in the case that $\mathfrak{m}$ is unramified, since this is the only setting we have considered. Once our results are extended to include the setting of ramified groups, the local integrability of the character on the whole group $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{K})$ will follow. We intend to pursue this in future work.

References

[1] Jeffrey D. Adler and Alan Roche, *An intertwining result for p-adic groups*, Canad. J. Math. **52** (2000), no. 3, 449–467.MR1758228 (2001m:22032)

[2] Jeffrey D. Adler and Stephen DeBacker, *Some applications of Bruhat–Tits theory to harmonic analysis on the Lie algebra of a reductive p-adic group*, Michigan Math. J. **50** (2002), no. 2, 263–286.MR1914065 (2003g:22016)

[3] ______, *Murnaghan–Kirillov theory for supercuspidal representations of tame general linear groups*, with appendices by Reid Huntsinger and Gopal Prasad, J. Reine Angew. Math. **575** (2004), 1–35.MR2097545 (2005j:22008)

[4] Jeffrey D. Adler and Jonathan Korman, *The local character expansion near a tame, semisimple element*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), no. 2, 381-403.

[5] Magdy Assem, *A note on rationality of orbital integrals on a p-adic group*, Manuscripta Math. **89** (1996), 267-279.

[6] J. Ax and S. Kochen, *Diophantine problems over local fields. I*, Amer. J. Math. **87** (1965), 605–630.

[7] Dan Barbasch and Allen Moy, *Local character expansions*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **30** (1997), no. 5, 553–567 (English, with English and French summaries).MR1474804 (99j:22021)

[8] François Bruhat and Jacques Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **41** (1972), 5–251 (French).MR0327923 (48 #6265)

[9] Laurent Clozel, *Characters of nonconnected, reductive p-adic groups*, Canad. J. Math. **39** (1987), no. 1, 149–167.MR889110 (88i:22039)

[10] Raf Cluckers, Clifton Cunningham, Julia Gordon, and Loren Spice, *On the computability of some positive-depth characters near the identity*, Represent. Theory **15** (2011), 531–567.

[11] Raf Cluckers and François Loeser, *Ax-Kochen-Eršov theorems for p-adic integrals and motivic integration*, Geometric methods in algebra and number theory, Progr. Math., vol. 235, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2005, pp. 109–137.

[12] Raf Cluckers and François Loeser, *Constructible exponential functions, motivic Fourier transform and transfer principle*, Annals of Mathematics **171** (2010), no. 2, 1011–1065.

[13] ———, *Constructible motivic functions and motivic integration*, Invent. Math. **173** (2008), no. 1, 23–121.

[14] Raf Cluckers, Thomas Hales, and François Loeser, *Transfer principle for the Fundamental Lemma*, On the Stabilization of the Trace Formula (L. Clozel, M. Harris, J.-P. Labesse, and B.-C. Ngô, eds.), International Press of Boston, 2011.

[15] Raf Cluckers, Julia Gordon, and Immanuel Halupczok, *Transfer principles for integrability and boundedness conditions for motivic exponential functions*, preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.4405 (2011).

[16] Stephen DeBacker, *Homogeneity results for invariant distributions of a reductive p-adic group*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **35** (2002), no. 3, 391–422 (English, with English and French summaries).MR1914003 (2003i:22019)

[17] ———, *Parametrizing nilpotent orbits via Bruhat–Tits theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **156** (2002), no. 1, 295–332.MR1935848 (2003i:20086)

[18] ———, *Lectures on harmonic analysis for reductive p-adic groups*, Representations of real and p-adic groups (Eng-Chye Tan and Chen-Bo Zhu, eds.), Lecture Notes Series. Institute for Mathematical Sciences. National University of Singapore, vol. 2, Singapore University Press, Singapore, 2004, pp. 47–94.MR2090869 (2005g:22009)

[19] Jan Denef and François Loeser, *Definable sets, motives and p-adic integrals*, J. Amer. Math. Soc **14** (2001), no. 2, 429–469.

[20] Jyotsna Mainkar Diwadkar, *Nilpotent conjugacy classes of reductive p-adic Lie algebras and definability in Pas's language*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pittsburgh (2006).

[21] ———, *Nilpotent conjugacy classes in p-adic Lie algebras: the odd orthogonal case*, Canadian J. Math **60** (2008), 88–108.

[22] Julia Gordon and Thomas C. Hales, *Virtual transfer factors*, Represent. Theory **7** (2003), 81–100 (electronic).

[23] Julia Gordon and Yoav Yaffe, *An Overview of Arithmetic Motivic Integration*, Ottawa lectures on Admissible Representations of reductive p-adic groups, Fields Institute Monograph series, vol. 26, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences, Toronto, ON, 2009.

[24] Thomas C. Hales, *Can p-adic integrals be computed?*, Contributions to automorphic forms, geometry, and number theory, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 2004, pp. 313–329.

[25] Harish-Chandra, *Harmonic analysis on reductive p-adic groups*, Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces (Calvin C. Moore, ed.), Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. 26, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1973, pp. 167–192.MR0340486 (49 #5238)

[26] ———, *A submersion principle and its applications*, Geometry and analysis: Papers dedicated to the memory of V. K. Patodi, Indian Academy of Sciences, Bangalore, 1980, pp. 95–102.MR592255 (82e:22032)

[27] ———, *Admissible invariant distributions on reductive p-adic groups*, with a preface and notes by Stephen DeBacker and Paul J. Sally, Jr., University Lecture Series, vol. 16, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.MR1702257 (2001b:22015)

[28] Roger E. Howe, *The Fourier transform and germs of characters (case of* Gl_n *over a p-adic field)*, Math. Ann. **208** (1974), 305–322.MR0342645 (49 #7391)

[29] Elliot Lawes, *Motivic Integration and the Regular Shalika Germ* (2003). P.D. Thesis, University of Michigan.

[30] Bertrand Lemaire, *Intégrabilité locale des caractères-distributions de* $\mathrm{GL}_N(F)$ *où* F *est un corps local non-archimédien de caractéristique quelconque*, Compositio Math. **100** (1996), no. 1, 41–75.

[31] ———, *Intégrabilité locale des caractères tordus de* $\mathrm{GL}_N(D)$, J. Reine Angew. Math. **566** (2004), 1–39.

[32] ———, *Intégrabilité locale des caractères de* $\mathrm{SL}_N(D)$, Pacific J. Math. **222** (2005), no. 1, 69–131.

[33] Allen Moy and Gopal Prasad, *Unrefined minimal K-types for p-adic groups*, Invent. Math. **116** (1994), no. 1–3, 393–408.MR1253198 (95f:22023)

[34] J. Oesterlé, *Réduction modulo p^n des sous-ensembles analytiques fermés de* $\mathbb{Z}_p^N$, Invent. Math. **66** (1982), no. 2, 325–341.

[35] Joseph Rabinoff, *The Bruhat-Tits building of a p-adic Chevalley group and an application to representation theory*, Harvard Senior Thesis (2005).

[36] R. Ranga Rao, *Orbital integrals in reductive groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **96** (1972), 505–510.MR0320232 (47 #8771)

[37] François Rodier, *Intégrabilité locale des caractères du groupe* $\mathrm{GL}(n,k)$ *où k est un corps local de caractéristique positive*, Duke Math. J. **52** (1985), no. 3, 771–792 (French).MR808104 (87e:22042)

[38] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Quelques applications du théorème de densité de Chebotarev*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **54** (1981), 323–401.

[39] Loren Spice, *Topological Jordan decompositions*, J. Algebra **341**, no. 8, 3141–3163.

[40] Tonny A. Springer, *Linear algebraic groups*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 9, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1998.MR1642713 (99h:20075)

[41] Willem Veys, *Reduction modulo p^n of p-adic subanalytic sets*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **112** (1992), no. 3, 483–486.

[42] Jean-Loup Waldspurger, *Intégrales orbitales nilpotentes et endoscopie pour les groupes classiques non ramifiés*, Astérisque **269** (2001), vi+449.

[43] Jiu-Kang Yu, *Smooth models associated to concave functions in Bruhat–Tits theory* (2002), preprint. Version 1.3.